

**The Maharaja Sayajirao Gaekwad Honorary Lecture, 1953-54**

# **ANCIENT INDIAN COLONIZATION IN SOUTH-EAST ASIA**

**By**  
**Dr. R. C. Majumdar,**  
M.A., Ph.D.

Author of Ancient Indian Colonies in the  
Far East—Campā, Suvarṇadvīpa—Kambujadeśa,  
Hindu Colonies in the Far East etc. etc.  
Formerly, Vice-Chancellor, Dacca University



First Edition 1955  
Second Edition 1963  
Third Edition 1971

954.01  
m2j

*Publisher :*

**B. J. Sandesara,**  
M.A., Ph.D.

DIRECTOR,  
ORIENTAL INSTITUTE,  
BARODA

( All rights reserved )

## PREFACE

*( To the First Edition )*

The Baroda State Government has initiated a scheme called " The Maharaja Sayajirao Gackwad Honorarium Lecture Series " under which an eminent scholar in any one or more of the following subjects was invited every year to deliver a series of lectures at Baroda and he was paid an honorarium of Rs. 5,000/

- |               |                                     |
|---------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. Poetry     | 5. Economics                        |
| 2. Literature | 6. Scientific Research              |
| 3. History    | 7. Fine Arts                        |
| 4. Philosophy | 8. Social Service and Social Reform |

On the merger of the Baroda State with the Bombay State, the Government of Bombay under Education Department G. R. No. 9107 dated the 28th March, 1950 entrusted the management of these lectures to the Maharaja Sayajirao University of Baroda and sanctioned a special recurring grant of Rs. 5,000/- for the purpose.

Some of the eminent scholars who have delivered lectures under this series are Dr. Radhakumud Mukerjee, Dr. Rabindranath Tagore, Shri C. V. Vaidya, Shri K. Natarajana, Dewan Bahadur K. H. Dhruva, Pandit V. N. Bhatkhande, Dr. S. N. Dasgupta, Dr. Sir Shafaat Ahmed Khan, Dr. ( Mrs. ) Sarojini Naidu, Dr. R. K. Das, Dr. T. E. Gregory, Sir C. V. Raman, Rao Bahadur K. V. Rangaswami Iyengar, Dr. Birbal Sahani, Dr. Sir J. C. Gosh, Professor K. T. Shah and Dr. D. N. Wadia.

The Maharaja Sayajirao University of Baroda invited Dr. R. C. Majumdar, M.A., Ph.D. to deliver lectures during the year 1953-54 and he was kind enough to accept our invitation. He delivered five lectures on " Ancient Indian Colonization in South-East Asia " under the Chairmanship of Shrimati Hansa Mehta, the Vice-Chancellor of the Maharaja Sayajirao University of Baroda, in room No. 1 of the Faculty of Arts at 5-0 p.m., from the 2nd to 6th December, 1953.

On the last day the learned lecturer projected some interesting photographs of antiquities illustrating the subject of his discourses. The lectures were highly appreciated by the audience for the wealth of information and mastery of exposition.

It is hoped that these lectures will be appreciated by students as well as scholars of Ancient Indian Culture.

The Maharaja Sayajirao University  
of Baroda.  
Dated 4th November, 1955.

K. J. MAJUMDAR  
Ag. Registrar

## INTRODUCTION

At the invitation of the Maharaja Sayajirao University of Baroda I delivered five Lectures on December 2, 1953, and the following days in the "Sayajirao Gaekwad Honorarium Lecture" series. These lectures are now published in the form of a book as prescribed in the Sayajirao Gaekwad Honorarium Rules. Excepting the addition of footnotes, the lectures are published as they were delivered. It was obviously impossible in course of these lectures to deal with all the aspects of "Ancient Indian Colonization in South-east Asia" which formed their subject matter. I have, therefore, confined myself to a few essential aspects, and discussed, somewhat in detail, only a few points on which there seems to have been a great deal of misconception in the minds of many scholars. I have already dealt with the subject in several publications, mentioned in the Bibliography. In these lectures I have touched only very briefly upon many points of great importance, partly for want of space and partly because these have been dealt with in detail in my previous publications. I have made a special endeavour to take into account all the new discoveries that have taken place since the publication of my books.

I take this opportunity to express my gratitude to the authorities of the M. S. University of Baroda for the honour they have done me by inviting me to deliver these lectures and I am also thankful to the Oriental Institute of Baroda for kindly seeing the book through the Press.

4 Bepin Pal Road,  
Calcutta-26.  
7th July, 1955.

R. C. Majumdar



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|  | Page  |
|--|-------|
| Preface  | iii   |
| Introduction   | v     |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY   | vii   |
| LECTURE I The Background of Hindu Colonization.  | 1-19  |
| Scope and importance of the subject, 1; Areas of colonization, 2; Routes from India, 4; Nature and origin of the colonization, 5; Antiquity of the colonization, 10; Culture and Civilization of the primitive peoples in the colonies, 13; Causes of Hindu Colonization, 14; Particular localities in India which supplied the colonists, 17. |       |
| LECTURE II The First Phase of Hindu Colonization.  | 20-35 |
| Fu-nan, 20; Kambuja, 24; Champā, 24; Malaya Peninsula, 28; Thailand, 31; Burma, 31; Java, 32; Śrī-Vijaya, 33; Bāli, 33; Borneo, 33.  |       |
| LECTURE III Hindu Empires in South-east Asia.  | 36-60 |
| Śrī-Vijaya, 36; Śailendras, 38; Java, 50; Kambuja, 52; Burma, 58.  |       |
| LECTURE IV Hindu Culture in South-east Asia.   | 61-79 |
| Sanskrit Language and Literature, 61; Art of Writing, 66; Religion, 66; Social Customs, 75.  |       |
| LECTURE V Hindu Art in South-east Asia.  | 80-92 |
| Architecture, 80; Criticism of Wales's view, 82; Criticism of the theory of South-Indian origin of Temples, 86; Collapse of art on the downfall of the Hindu power, 92.  |       |
| INDEX  | 93-99 |

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aymonier, E. —*Le Cambodge*—3 Vols. Paris, 1900, 1901, 1904.
- Barth and Bergaigne —*Inscriptions Sanscrites du Cambodge et Campā*. Paris, 1885.
- Bose, P. —*The Indian Colony of Campā*. Adyar, 1926.  
—*The Hindu Colony of Cambodia*. Adyar, 1927.  
—*The Hindu Colony of Siam*. Lahore, 1927.
- Chatterji, B. R. —*Indian Cultural Influence in Cambodia*. Calcutta, 1928.  
—*India and Java*. Calcutta, 1933.
- Cocdes, G. —*Les États Hindouisés D' Indochine et D' Indonésie*. Paris, 1948.  
—*Inscriptions du Cambodge*. Vols. I-VI. Hanoi, 1937-1954.
- Goloubew, Victor —*Art et Archeologie de l' Indochine*. Hanoi, 1938.
- Gonda, J. —*Sanskrit in Indonesia*. Nagpur, 1952.
- Krom, N. J. —*Hinde-Javaansche Geschiednis*. The Hague, 1931.  
—*Hindoe-Javaanche Kunst*. The Hague, 1923.
- Majumdar, R. C. —*Ancient Indian Colonies in the Far East*. Vol. 1: *Campā*. Lahore, 1927; Vol. II: *Suvarṇadvīpa*. Parts 1 and 2. Dacca, 1937, 1938.  
—*Kambujadeśa*. Madras, 1944.  
—*Hindu Colonies in the Far East*. Calcutta, 1944.  
—*Inscriptions of Kambuja*. Calcutta, 1953.
- Maspero, M. G. —*Le Royaume de Campā*. Paris, 1928.
- May, R. Le —*A Concise History of Buddhist Art in Siam*. Cambridge, 1938.
- Mukherji, P. K. —*Indian Literature in China and the Far East*. Calcutta, 1931.
- Parmentier, H. —*L' Art Architectural Hindou Dans L' Inde Et En Extreme-Orient*. Paris, 1948.
- Phillips, C. A. —*The Civilizations of the East-India*. London, 1932.  
(Eng. Transl. of Rene Grousset's book ).

- Remusat, Coral — *Les Arts de l' Indochine*. Paris, 1938.
- Rene Grousset — *Civilisations de l' Extreme Orient* ( 2 Vols. ). Paris, 1929-1930.
- Salmony, A. — *Sculpture in Siam*. London, 1925.
- Sarkar, H. B. — *Indian Influence on the Literature of Java and Bali*. Calcutta, 1934.
- Sastri, K. A. N. — *South Indian Influence in the Far East*. Bombay, 1949.  
— *History of Śrīvijaya*. Madras, 1949.
- Stern, P. — *L' Art du Campā*. Paris, 1942.  
— *Le Bayon D' Angkor et l' Evolution de l' Art Khmer*. Paris, 1927.
- Vogel, J. Ph. — *Buddhist Art in India, Ceylon and Java*. Oxford, 1936.  
— *The Relation between the Art of India and Java*. London, 1925.
- Wales, H. G. Q. — *The Making of Greater India*. London, 1951.
- Winstedt, R. D. — *Malaya and its History*. London, 1948.  
— *The Malays: A Cultural History*. Singapore, 1947.
- Wood, W. A. R. — *A History of Siam*. London, 1926.

## LECTURE I

### THE BACKGROUND OF HINDU COLONIZATION

I am deeply thankful to the authorities of this University for having invited me to deliver the Sayajirao Gaekwar Honorarium Lectures. The illustrious person with whose name these lectures are associated has now secured a definite place in modern Indian history and will long be remembered as one of the most enlightened rulers of Indian States during the British regime. I had the rare good fortune of coming into close personal contact with him during a steamer trip from Bombay to Marseilles just a quarter of a century ago, and the impression I formed of his frank and jovial personality during the ten days of our travel is still vivid in my mind. I take this opportunity of paying my humble tribute of respect to his blessed memory. The association of his hallowed name with these lectures as well as the long list of distinguished scholars who delivered them in the past adds to the gravity of my task, and I am fully conscious how unworthy I am to discharge the heavy responsibility that lies on my shoulders. I can only try my best and crave your indulgence for my shortcomings.

I propose to deliver a course of five lectures on India's contact with South-East Asia. As the region covers a wide and extensive area, and the contact was both political and cultural, the subject cannot be treated in detail in a systematic manner in course of these lectures. Nor is it necessary to do so. There are already a few books which give general information in respect of the different countries comprised within the geographical area, and I have myself written several books and articles on this subject. I do not wish to traverse the ground already covered by these publications. I would rather attempt a general survey of the whole area, laying special stress upon those problems and topics which have formed subjects of special study or keen controversy in recent years. I would thus make an endeavour to bring up-to-date our knowledge of this important and fascinating subject in some of its aspects, which have recently emerged into importance by new discoveries, researches and discussions.

It will not be desirable, however, to plunge immediately into these problems without a general reference, however brief, to the important factors which form the background of our study. This is all the more necessary in view of the fact that the study of the subject is of recent growth, and is still in its infancy in our country. It is true that archaeological discoveries in Indo-China and Indonesia, bearing upon India's contact with these regions, date back to the last century, but unfortunately the publications on the subject, being written in Dutch and French, were but little known to Indians who are generally ignorant of these languages. I still recall that the text of Indian History which I had to read in

schools emphasised the unique character of Indian culture due to the fact that India lived in splendid isolation and never came into contact with the outside world. We were gravely told in these books that India never influenced nor was influenced by any foreign country.

These ideas are so deeply rooted in the minds of Indians that even the educated section is not quite free from them. The result is that though the conception of a Greater India had been promulgated by a handful of Indian scholars, during the last thirty years or more, it has not yet made much headway, and the general Indian attitude towards this subject is marked by apathy and ignorance.

I would therefore begin these series of lectures with a brief survey of some preliminary points of a general nature, a correct knowledge of which is essential to a proper understanding of the subject, *viz.* India's contact with South-East Asia.

In the first place, it is necessary to define the geographical area which I have in view. As is well-known, India's cultural contact extended to wide regions all over Asia. But I purpose to deal with only that part of it which is now covered by East Indies, Burma, and the Peninsula of Indo-China, excluding Tonkin, which, though a part of Indo-China, is excluded from my purview as its political and cultural contact was with China rather than with India.

The area, thus defined, falls into two broad divisions, *viz.*, the continental plain and the islands. The former is separated from India and China by high mountains starting from Central Asia. These throw out parallel ranges of hills, called Yomas, running north to south, right across the whole area. The valleys enclosed by them are watered by a number of rivers also running north to south. Beginning from the west these are the Irawadi, with its tributary the Chindwin, the Sittang, the Salween, the Menam and the Mekong. The first four are in Burma, while the Menam runs through the whole of Siam or Thailand as it is called today.

Northern Siam, laying between the Salween and the Upper Mekong, is a land of narrow valleys separated by steep longitudinal spurs rising occasionally to a height of more than 8,000 ft., but Central Siam is mostly an alluvial plain watered by the Menam and a number of smaller rivers. The northern part of Malay Peninsula, up to the Isthmus of Kra, is politically part of Siam and is generally referred to as Southern Siam. But geographically Malay Peninsula extends from the head of the Gulf of Siam to Singapore Strait. Its most characteristic physical features are the long range of granite mountains running along its whole length, and the ever-green forests, mostly dense jungles, which cover a large part of the country and the major part of which is yet untrodden by human foot.

The country now called Viet Nam (till recently Annam), but whose central

and southern part was formerly known as Champā, forms the eastern boundary of the area. It is bounded on the east by the Sea of China and on the west by a chain of hills covered with rich forests. This long narrow strip of land between the sea and the high mountains, ranging in height from six to eight thousand feet, is further intersected by numerous spurs of hills and a large number of small rivulets issuing from them. The habitable zone of Champā nowhere exceeds seventy miles, in breadth.

The central region, lying between Siam and Annam or Champā, is to-day covered by three countries known as Laos, Cambodia and Cochin-China. In the ancient times they formed a political unit known as Kambuja-deśa from which the modern name Cambodia is derived. Through this entire region flows the mighty river Mekong, first along the eastern border of Burma and Siam, and the western border of the hilly country of Laos, and then passing over the Dangrek range enters the plain of Cambodia proper near Khong. From this point the river is enlarged to nearly double its breadth and covers almost the whole of Cambodia by its ramifications. Indeed this majestic river played the same part in Kambuja as the Gaṅgā in Northern India and the Nile in Egypt. A wide sheet of water connects this river to the vast lake called Tonle Sap, the border of which, known as Angkor region, formed the centre of Kambuja history and culture. From this point of junction, near the modern capital city of Pnom Penh, the Mekong branches off into two wide streams, connected by numerous cross canals till they both fall into the sea forming the rich delta of Cochin-China.

The southern part of Malay Peninsula forms the tongue of land by which Indo-China projects far into the Indian ocean, between China Sea on the east and the Bay of Bengal on the west. The narrow strait of Malacca separates it from the big island of Sumatra lying to its west and south. The very narrow strait of Sunda separates Sumatra from the island of Java to its south-east. Then follows a series of small islands in a long chain from west to east beginning with Bali and stretching almost up to New Guinea. To the north of this is another chain consisting of the big islands of Borneo and Celebes and the group known as Molucca islands. Further north is another group known as Philippine islands. These islands of varying size more than six thousand in number, are collectively known by various names such as Indian Archipelago, Malay Archipelago, Asiatic Archipelago, Indonesia and Insulinde.

Almost all over the geographical area described above, we find settlements of the Hindus during the early centuries of the Christian era. The term Hindu is used here in a very broad sense. It does not refer to followers of Brahmanical, as opposed to those of heterodox religions like Buddhism and Jainism. As is well-known the word Hindu is derived from Sindhu, the name of the mighty river on the western border of India. The Parsis used this name to denote also the territory lying on the bank of the river, that is to say that part of our country

which was then known to them. Gradually the name Sindhu in its phonetically changed form Hindu came to denote the whole of this country. The European forms Indika, India, Inde and the Chinese form Indu are all derived from this. The term Hindu, therefore, means the same geographical area as India, as well as its people. But the people of this country never called themselves by this name before the advent of the Muslims when the sharp differences in religion necessitated the use of two different terms to denote the two distinct classes of people. Henceforth the term Hindu came to denote the people of India other than the Muslims. I have used this term in the same sense, in the absence of a better one, to denote the people of India as a whole before the Muslim invasion. The term Indian would be misleading as it would include also the Muslims who had nothing to do with the phase of colonization which it is the object of these lectures to describe.

Having broadly defined the region where the Hindus set up their colonies, it is necessary to discuss the different routes by which they proceeded to these distant lands. This can be approximately determined by archaeological evidence, and the Chinese and other literary accounts including local traditions. These routes can be divided into three classes *viz.* (1) by land; (2) by sea; and (3) partly by sea and partly by land.

From early times, there was a regular trade-route by land between Eastern India and China through Upper Burma and Yunnan. We know from Chinese chronicles that in the second century B.C. merchants with their wares travelled from China across the whole of North India and Afghanistan to Bactria. Through this route came twenty Chinese priests for whom, according to I-tsing, an Indian king built a temple in the third or fourth century A.D. From different points along this route one could pass to Lower Burma and other parts of Indo-China, and a Chinese writer, Kia Tan, refers to a land-route between Annam and India.<sup>1</sup> There was a more direct route between Eastern India and Burma through Arracan to which reference is made in the Burmese chronicles.

The all-sea route at first lay along the coast from Indian ports to different parts of South-east Asia. The two extreme points in India for the departure of the vessels were Broach on the west and Tāmralipti on the east, and there were many good harbours between these two, both along the eastern and the western coast. We know detailed accounts of these from the *Periplus of the Erythraean Sea* and Ptolemy. According to the latter, the vessels, bound for Malay Peninsula and other ports further beyond, made the coastal voyage as far as Paloura, near modern Gopalpur in Ganjam District, and then made a direct voyage across the high seas. Having reached Malay Peninsula the vessels could pass through Malacca Strait to the different islands of the East Indies and

1 *JA*, II-XII (1919), p. 461.

the coast of Indo-Chinese Peninsula. But, as in the latter case the vessels had to double the entire length of the Peninsula, many travellers got down at the Isthmus of Kra, and cut across the Malay Peninsula at its narrowest point from Takua Pa to Caiya and other places on the opposite coast of the Bay of Bandon. This is proved by archaeological remains round about these places. There is also a persistent local tradition in favour of early migration of Indians across this route. Persons of an Indian cast of features are common on the west coast near Takua Pa, while colonies of Indian descent still survive on the coast of the Bay of Bandon and trace the arrival of their ancestors from India by an overland route across the Malay Peninsula.<sup>2</sup>

In addition to the coastal voyage described above, there must have been direct voyages from South India, either through the channel between Andaman and Nicobar Islands or to the south of the latter, making respectively for Takua Pa or Kedah in Malay Peninsula, where ancient archaeological remains have come to light.

Similarly vessels from Andhra coast or countries further north could sail either along the coast or directly to Tavoy. The travellers landed there and then, crossing the mountains by the Pass of the three Pagodas, proceeded to the delta of the Menam by the Kanburi river near the banks of which ancient ruins have been found at Pong Tuk and Pra Pathom. Further to the north there was a practicable route from the port of Moulmein to the town of Raheng on one of the branches of the Menam. From the valley of the Menam there was a route to the valley of the Mekong across the plateau *via* Si Tep where very old remains have come to light.<sup>3</sup>

We may now consider some problems in connection with the Hindu colonization in South-east Asia. The very first concerns its nature and origin. It is a singular fact that in spite of the very large area and the long duration of this colonization it has found no place in any historical records of India, nor can we trace even a faint echo of it in our extensive literature. The solitary reference in *Kaṇḍiyya's Arthaśāstra* about sending the excess population to a new settlement, of which much has been made by a certain class of writers, is of such a vague and general nature that we cannot reasonably deduce from it any reliable information about colonization in general, even in India itself, far less that in a far-off land beyond the boundaries of India.<sup>4</sup> Indeed so complete is the absence of any clear record or reference in this respect, that until evidence was forthcoming from those colonies in recent times, no one in this country had the remotest idea about

---

2 This point has been discussed in detail by Dr. H. G. Q. Wales in *Indian Art and Letters*, Vol. IX, No. 1, pp. 1 ff.

3 Coedès—*Etats*, pp. 54-55.

4 Cf. Finot's criticism in *BEFEO*, XII, 8(1-4).



flourishing Hindu settlements in those far-off regions in the south-east beyond the sea. Not only was there lack of any positive evidence, but such evidences as we did possess were rather calculated to negative any such idea. The prohibition of sea-voyage and the general aversion to association with non-Hindus or *mlechchhas* who were regarded as unclean or impure, are so strongly emphasised in our Smritis that one would naturally rule out the possibility of the Hindus ever crossing the sea and settling among the primitive tribes of South-east Asia.

How are we, then, to reconcile the Indian testimony to the patent fact of Hindu colonization on a wide scale in South-east Asia? The question is not easy to answer, but we may offer a hypothetic reconstruction of the whole process of this colonization which will explain the reticence of Indian records in this respect.

In the first place, we must not presume that this colonization was the result of any military expedition, deliberately undertaken by any Indian king for this purpose.<sup>4a</sup> There is, of course, no inherent impossibility in such a view. We know that the Chola emperors in the eleventh century A.D. fitted out naval expeditions and conquered a wide region in Sumatra and Malay Peninsula. About 700 years earlier the Gupta emperor Samudra-gupta claimed to have exercised suzerainty over "all islands." Still earlier, the figure of sailing vessels on the coins of Sātavāhana kings may be taken to indicate their supremacy over lands beyond the sea. The specific statement by Megasthenes that the Maurya emperor had an organised department for Admiralty brings such a maritime expedition within the range of possibility for the period after 300 B.C., if not before it.

But while colonization as a result of political conquest cannot, therefore, be altogether ruled out as a theory, it is hardly compatible with the Indian evidence or rather lack of it, to which reference has been made above. A deliberate scheme of colonization, sustained by military force from India, would necessarily have involved close contact with the motherland, at least for a fairly long time. Is it likely that such a prolonged and intimate contact would not have left any trace in our literature, at least in the shape of an improved knowledge of the topography of this region? But there is no such trace, and even the late Purāṇas do not seem to indicate any advance in the idea of the geography of this region.

For the same reason the Hindu colonization does not also seem to be due to any organised private effort on a large scale like that of the Pilgrim Fathers in America, though this is less unlikely than the theory of political conquest.

It appears more probable that the colonization was the culmination of what was originally mere adventurous enterprise of individuals or small isolated groups who undertook the risky voyage for their personal ends. Such voyages

---

<sup>4a</sup> No one has seriously taken the suggestions of K. A. N. Sastri that the Pallava king Nandivarman III made conquests in this region (*J. Mal. Br. R.A.S.* XXII—30).

were not likely to draw public attention or to create any commotion or excitement, but nevertheless our literature has kept a faithful account of it in the form of legends or fables.

There are many references to sea-voyages between Indian ports and Suvarṇa-bhūmi or Suvarṇa-dvīpa, in old popular stories in the Sanskrit works based upon the lost *Brhat-kathā*, as well as in Buddhist Jātakas, Jain *Samarāichcha-kahā* and other works. The heroes of most of these stories are merchants and, in a few cases, princes, or chiefs in straitened circumstances, who wanted to acquire wealth by trade or other means. The *Kathākośa* relates the story of Nāgadatta who went to Suvarṇa-dvīpa with five hundred ships in order to acquire wealth. The Buddhist works *Milindapañha* and *Niddesa* also refer to regular trading voyages to Suvarṇa-bhūmi.

I have elsewhere<sup>5</sup> discussed in detail the location of Suvarṇa-bhūmi and Suvarṇa-dvīpa which figure prominently in Indian literature and are also referred to in Greek, Latin, Arabic and Chinese writings. There is hardly any doubt that they at first denoted, in a vague general way, both Indo-China and Indonesia, though in later times either name was applied to denote particular regions in this vast area.

The folk-literature in India thus clearly refers to regular voyages between India and South-East Asia and there is no doubt that Indian merchants visited different parts of that region for purposes of trade.

The merchants in India, as in other countries, must have been the pioneers in the exploration of South-east Asia. The knowledge and experience gained by them must have induced not only other traders, but also peoples of different categories to follow in their wake. Kṣatriya chiefs, dispossessed of their territories, are represented in Jātakas to have betaken themselves to Suvarṇa-bhūmi to try their fortune. On the other hand the traditions current in various countries of South-east Asia represent individual Kṣatriya chiefs of India—princes banished by their fathers, or fleeing from enemies, or directed by supernatural agencies—as conquering heroes who founded royal dynasties. We have also stories of religious missionaries, visiting these lands for religious propaganda. These individual stories cannot, of course, be taken to be true, but they are not altogether devoid of historical value. They support the theory, mentioned above, that individuals or small groups—merchants, Kṣatriya chiefs and religious missionaries—were the pioneers of the Hindu Colonization in South-east Asia.

How these individuals, unaided by state or other organizations at home, succeeded not only in establishing their political authority over the numerous foreign peoples in such distant lands, but also in transforming their entire cultural

---

5 *Suvarṇadvīpa*, Ch. IV.

life, is the problem that should next engage our attention. Some writers, possessing intimate knowledge of primitive tribes in Asia and Africa, have suggested the different stages in this process of Hindu Colonization on the analogy of what happened in later and more recent times when Islam gradually established itself among them. According to this view, which seems highly probable, we may reconstruct the process of Indian Colonization somewhat as follows.<sup>6</sup>

Two or three Indian vessels sailing together reach a coastal town. The new-comers ingratiate themselves into the favour of the local chiefs by costly or curious presents, their real or pretended knowledge of healing arts, and also magical powers to prevent illness or drive away evil spirits. Some of them assume lofty airs as belonging to royal or noble family and possessing immense wealth. All these highly impress the ruling chief as well as the common people who look upon the Hindus as people of superior race. The latter settle down among them, learn their language and marry the local girls. The leaders of the new immigrants naturally select the daughters of the chiefs or at least girls of high family. These wives are soon initiated into the religious and moral ideas and beliefs and social customs of their husbands and become instrumental in spreading them among the indigenous people. It is almost a universal law that when a higher and a lower type of culture come into close contact, the latter yields to the former. The native wives of the Indians become the best missionaries for the propagation of Hindu religion and culture. Gradually the new culture spreads from the coastal region to the interior, and from one locality to another. Ultimately, either the king adopts the Hindu faith, or some Hindu immigrant succeeds in winning his favour and marries into royal family, thus assuring the complete triumph of Hindu culture. In some cases the Hindu immigrants, backed by support of Hinduized natives, take advantage of changing political situations to seize the royal power. To explain satisfactorily the thorough-going conquest of Hindu culture in all aspects of life, we must assume that the Hindu immigrants included not only merchants, but also Brāhmaṇas and Kṣatriyas, as well as people following different arts and crafts. It is not necessary to suppose that they all came together; it is more likely that they represent successive waves of immigration from India, each being encouraged by the good reports about the new settlements carried by the returning emigrants. For we must suppose that all the original emigrants did not settle permanently in those far-off lands, and while some chose to stay on, others returned home after a short or long stay.

This imaginary picture, based on actual happenings in later times, is corroborated by the local traditions current in different Hindu colonies about their founders. The earliest recorded tradition of this nature describes the founda-

6 Ferrand in *JA*, 1919, pp. 15 ff. Winstedt in *J. Mal. Br. R. A. S.* XIII, p. 18, *JRAS*, 1944, p. 186.

tion of the Hindu political authority in Cochin-China and South Cambodia. There was a kingdom in this locality, called Fu-nan by the Chinese. Once a follower of orthodox Brāhmanical faith, directed by God in a dream, came to this kingdom in a trading vessel. The female ruler of this place came to plunder the vessel, but being overawed by the military skill and prowess, submitted to the new-comer, who married her and ruled the country. This story was recorded by the Chinese in the middle of the third century A.D. and must have been current long before that. It is echoed in an epigraphic record, dated 657 A.D., in reference to the foundation of Bhavapura, the capital of Kambuja. We are told that the Brāhmaṇa Kauṇḍinya married Somā, the daughter of the Nāga king, and from this union sprang the royal family. The Chinese form of the name of the hero, viz. Huen-tien, is an exact reproduction of Kauṇḍinya, and both the stories are obviously different versions of the same, though one refers to Fu-nan and the other to Kambuja. A somewhat modified tradition about Kambuja ascribes its foundation to a son of king of Indraprastha who was banished by his father. He occupied the country by defeating the local ruler and then married the daughter of a Nāga ruler who extended the boundaries of his kingdom. Similarly the foundation of Ligor in Malay Peninsula is ascribed by tradition to a descendant of Aśoka who fled from Magadha, embarked a vessel at Dantapura, and was wrecked on the coast of the Malay Peninsula. Finally, we have a story preserved in the chronicles of Java that the island was first colonised by a prince of Hastināpura who sailed from Gujarat.

In contrast to all these stories, where the foundation is ascribed to individual heroes, the Burmese chronicles record a regular military expedition. We are told that Abhirāja, a prince of the Śākya clan of Kapilavastu, marched with an army to Upper Burma, founded the city of Sankissa on the Upper Irawadi, and set himself up as the king of the surrounding region. It is worthy of note that in all these traditions current from one end of the region to the other, such a story is told of the only country where it was not beyond the range of possibility. For the military conquest of a region in Upper Burma by an Indian chief was not a very difficult operation even in those early days.

Side by side with the stories of individual Hindu chiefs founding the different colonial kingdoms, we have also many traditions of small Indian settlements having developed into important kingdoms. Thus according to traditions current in Pegu Hindu colonists from the country of the lower courses of the Krishna and Godavari had, at a remote time, crossed the sea and formed settlements in the delta of the Irawadi and on the adjoining coast. Later, some of these settlers founded the kingdoms of Thaton and Pegu. Similar traditions are current about the Hindus from the Kālīṅga coast having colonised Java and other islands.

These local traditions are mostly concerned with the foundation of political authority, and may be taken to indicate in a general way how the Hindus

gradually usurped royal power in the various localities. But they do not throw much light on the actual process of colonisation and cultural penetration by the Hindus. Some light is thrown on it by the Chinese accounts of the kingdom of Tuen-siun in Malay Peninsula.

On account of its advantageous geographical position, on the sea, it formed a meeting ground between the east and the west. The merchants from India and Parthia came here in large numbers to carry on trade and commerce, and the local market was frequented every day by more than ten thousand men.

A Chinese chronicle preserves an account of this place given by an Indian who visited it in the fifth century A.D. We are told that five hundred Indian families of Hu or probably mercantile class and more than a thousand Brāhmaṇas lived there. Most of these Brāhmaṇas permanently settled in the country with the result that the local people followed their religion and gave them their daughters in marriage. This short but valuable account of the kingdom of Tuen-siun fully supports the general process of Hindu colonization sketched above. It shows that while trade was the first or the main incentive to colonization, its character was entirely changed by the missionary zeal of the Brāhmaṇas.

Fu-nan, which exercised suzerain authority over the kingdom of Tuen-siun, was itself an important market town where met the traders from India and China. It was the oldest Hindu colonial kingdom in this region known so far, and the first to build up an empire. It is not unlikely that it was the result of the same process of colonization which we find at work in later times in Tuen-siun.

Having thrown some light on the nature and process of Hindu colonization we may now proceed to discuss its antiquity.

Reference has been made above to the tradition about the conquest of Fu-nan by Brāhmaṇa Kauṇḍinya. This was recorded by the Chinese ambassador K'ang T'ai who visited Fu-nan, probably some time between A.D. 245 and 250. He refers to a number of kings who succeeded Kauṇḍinya. One of these died at the advanced age of ninety, and his third successor sent an embassy to China in 243 A.D. Kauṇḍinya must have therefore reigned in the first century A.D., if not earlier still. For the present this is the earliest date to which we can definitely trace back the foundation of Hindu political authority in Indo-China.

The oldest Sanskrit inscription in Indo-China is engraved on a block of granite found close to the village of Vo-can in the province of Khanh-Hoa in South Annam. It records the donation made by a king belonging to the family of Śrī-Māra. As this inscription has been referred on palaeographic grounds to the second or third century A.D.,<sup>7</sup> king Śrī-Māra must have flourished some time before it.

7 This question has been further discussed in Lecture II.

Ptolemy's Geography, composed in the second century A.D., refers to many geographical names of Indian origin from Burma to Java. The Buddhist canonical text *Niddesa*, probably composed about the same time, if not earlier, similarly contains a long list of place-names of Sanskrit origin which can be located in the same region.

Reference is made in a Chinese history to an embassy sent to China in 132 A.D. by Tiao-pien, king of Ye-tiao. Pelliot recognised long ago the identity of Ye-tiao with Yavadvīpa, and Ferrand took the name of the king as a Chinese rendering of Sanskrit Deva-varman. If these identifications be accepted, we must date back the foundation of a Hindu Kingdom in Java towards the end of the first or the beginning of the second century A.D. at the latest. It may be noted in this connection that the Sanskrit name Yavadvīpa also occurs in the *Rāmāyaṇa*.

The discovery of isolated Brāhmī alphabets on stones in Burma carries back the association of the Hindus with this region to the first two centuries of the Christian era. According to Chinese chronicles of the third century A.D., a kingdom called Lin-yang, which has been located by some scholars in Central Burma, had a Buddhist population of over 100,000 families including several thousand monks.

The Chinese history of the Liang Dynasty mentions a country called Lang-ya-su situated in Malay Peninsula "which, the people say, was established more than four hundred years ago." As this king put a high value on Sanskrit, and the Chinese history deals with the first half of the sixth century A.D., we find here an evidence of a Hindu Colony at the beginning of the second century A.D.

The few definite facts, culled above, leave no doubt that by the beginning of the Christian era the Hindu Colonization had taken deep root in the soil all over the region from Burma in the north to Java and Annam in the south and south-east. This is also corroborated by the discovery of the images of Buddha of Amarāvati style, of approximately second or third century A.D., in the islands of Sumatra, Java, and Celebes, and on the mainland in Siam and Annam.

The same conclusion follows from the recent discovery of archaeological remains of one of the oldest Hindu settlements in Indo-China. This site, with the Annamite name Oc-Eo, is situated to the west of Cochin-China, and about 16 miles from the present coast of the Gulf of Siam.<sup>8</sup>

Archaeological discoveries and aerial reconnaissance have shown that there are remains of a city which stretched in a rectangle about two miles long by one mile broad, covering thus an area of more than two thousand acres.

8 The account that follows is based on a Lecture by Paul Levy, published in *Sir William Jones Birth Bicentenary Commemoration Volume* (pp. 114 ff.).

The ground is literally stuffed with fragments of pottery whose decoration connects them with pottery found on other prehistoric sites of southern Indo-China and the Malay Peninsula. The shape of this pottery, when a vase is by chance discovered intact, is clearly Hindu in origin.

Numerous beads of rock crystal, carnelian, onyx, amethyst and coloured glass completely prove the Hindu origin of the culture of Oc-Eo if there were not also other finds even more convincing.

First, there are numerous lead amulets inscribed with Brahmanic symbols, and coins of the classic type called "*A soleil*" ( decorated with a sun ).

Second, there are gold ornaments—bracelets, rings, pendants and seals—engraved with inscriptions in an alphabet of Hindu origin, which may be dated in the second century A.D., and later periods.

There are also, and above all, hundreds of intaglios and cameos in carnelian rock crystals or sardonyx, either with Sanskrit inscriptions or with Hindu-Hellenistic ( Gracco-Hindu ) animals, symbols, figures or profiles.

Several objects are, undoubtedly, of a Roman origin. There is, for example, a gold medal bearing the effigy of the celebrated Marcus Aurelius, one of the most famous Roman Emperors of the Antonine dynasty.

This medal enables us to date the remains in the second century A.D. Reference may be made in this connection to a Roman lamp at Pong Tuk, in Siam, belonging to the same period. These finds may be connected with the journey of a band of musicians and acrobats from Rome to China via Burma in 120 A.D., and also the embassy of Marcus Aurelius to China, about 166 A.D.

The view that the beginnings of Indian Colonization in South-east Asia should be placed not later than the first century A.D. is also supported by the fact that trade relations between India and China, by way of sea, may be traced back to the second century B.C.<sup>9</sup> As the Chinese vessels did not proceed beyond Northern Annam till after the first century A.D., it may be presumed that the Indian vessels plied at least as far as Annam even in the second century B.C. As the vessels in those days kept close to the coast, we may conclude that even in the second century B.C. Indian mariners and merchants must have been quite familiar with those regions in Indo-China and Malay Archipelago, where we find Indian colonies at a later date. It is therefore quite probable that Indian colonies were set up in the first century A.D. or even earlier.

The archaeological remains at Oc-Eo prove that the site was originally a settlement of the neolithic period, which was directly occupied by the Hindu colonists without any gap or intervening period. Such immediate transition from Neolithic to Hindu period is also attested by archaeological finds in other

9 *T'oung Pao*, XIII ( 1912 ), pp. 457-61; *IHQ*, XIV, 380.

places such as Sa-huynh in Annam, Samrong Seu in Cambodia, Kuala Selinsing in Malay Peninsula, and at Sempaga in the island of Celebes. All these prove that when the Hindu colonists arrived in this region, they found the local people in that primitive state of culture which may be collectively referred to as late Neolithic.

This has a great bearing on an important question on which there has been a great deal of discussion and considerable difference of opinion, *viz.* the culture and civilization of the peoples with whom the first Hindu Colonists in this region came into contact. Without entering into these controversies in detail, I may state here the main conclusions together with the arguments on which they are based. The inference drawn from the archaeological evidence that the local people were in a state of Neolithic culture when the Hindus first came into contact with them cannot be brushed aside except on very strong positive evidence. Certain Dutch scholars hold the view that these peoples, specially those of Java, had a very high degree of civilization, including a knowledge of shadow-play, called Wajang, together with the music accompanying it known as gamelan, different kinds of metre, and the art of weaving Batik cloth. This conclusion, based upon a study of the people of modern Java, is incompatible with the Neolithic culture, and has not therefore found much favour with scholars. The Neolithic culture, evidenced by archaeological remains, resembles to a great extent that of non-Aryan peoples in India like the Khasis and the Mundas. It has also been held by eminent scholars that the languages spoken by these aboriginal peoples of India and those of Indo-China and Indonesia belong to the same stock. It has further been held that these aborigines of India, driven by the Aryans and Dravidians, migrated to Indo-China and Indonesia, and imposed their authority upon the primitive peoples of those lands. According to this view, the Hindu colonization of South-east Asia is merely a further eastward extension of the Aryan conquest of India, and was merely a continuation of the process already begun by the peoples who inhabited India before them. Such a theory, from its very nature, cannot be regarded as an established historical fact. It has been argued, for example, on the other hand, that the early process of colonization was just the reverse, *viz.* that the peoples of South-east Asia colonised before the Aryans conquered the country and drove them away. But whatever we may think of this, there is a general consensus of opinion that the peoples whom the Hindu colonists met in South-east Asia had not developed much beyond the state of culture which the Aryan conquerors of India found among the ancestors of Khasis and Mundas, and which is still to be found among them.

But these primitive peoples were not savages or barbarians, and we may get some idea of their culture by a study of their languages and of the manners and customs of their descendants who still live in hills and dales unaffected by later civilization. They cultivated banana, sugarcane, cucumber, etc. and also



probably rice. They were fond of hunting and fishing and tended buffaloes, pigs, and probably also cows, for meat and milk. They built houses of bamboo, wood and rattan and knew the use of iron. They wore barks of trees, though some of them knew the art of weaving. They knew the art of navigation and the elementary knowledge of astronomy necessary for it. Their religion was animism pure and simple.

This picture is only true in a general way, for there must have been variations in different localities. For example, we have the positive statement in Chinese records that the people of Fu-nan, both men and women, went about naked until the Indian settlers taught them the use of cloth. This indicates that some elements in the population were in a more primitive state than the above picture would suggest. It is also a warning against the too ready assumption of a high degree of culture in the communities among whom the Hindu colonists settled.

But while it is necessary to admit variations in the degrees of culture among the different communities whom the Hindu colonists met, it is not easy to make an assessment of their individual nature or worth either qualitatively or quantitatively. The recent attempt in this direction by H. G. Wales seems to be too speculative to be of much historical value, and will be discussed later.

Wales, and others who think like him, seem to be obsessed with the great importance of the Neolithic culture of the peoples with whom the Hindu colonists first came into contact, and attach a far greater value to it in their historical evolution than the influence which centuries of close and intimate contact with the Hindus had exercised upon them. This conscious or unconscious attempt to exaggerate the local factor and belittle the importance of Hindu element, and thereby change the entire conception of the value and importance of Hindu culture in South-east Asia, seems to be a characteristic of certain classes of writers.

Finally we must refer to two questions of a speculative nature in connection with Hindu Colonization which have aroused great interest and provoked much discussion. The first relates to the cause or causes of the Hindu Colonization. Reference has been made above to the probable stages of this colonization, beginning with motives of trade and ending in political and cultural conquest. Some scholars, however, seek to particularise a few definite waves of migration from India and assign causes to the same. They hold that as the Aryan conquest drove the pre-Aryan settlers of India towards the countries beyond the sea in the east and south-east, the Hindus, too, were forced to migrate there in large numbers by political events in later times. The first wave of Hindu Colonization in the early centuries of the Christian era is attributed by them to the invasion of India by the foreign hordes such as the Greeks, Śakas and Kuṣāṇas. A second wave of Hindu colonization, inferred from certain traditions and the simultaneous rise of a number of Hindu states testified to by Sanskrit inscriptions, is explained

by Samudra-gupta's conquest of the Deccan leading to a wholesale migration of coastal people.<sup>10</sup>

It is to be remembered, however, that the conquests of the foreigners in the early centuries of the Christian era hardly affected the area beyond Banaras and spent their force long before that. There was ample space in India itself for the refugees to take shelter, and it is therefore difficult to regard the foreign conquest as a sufficient cause, by itself, for a large scale migration to a distant land beyond the sea. Similarly, the conquest of Samudra-gupta in the south was more an assertion of suzerainty than any actual subjugation. Even the defeated kings were restored to the throne. So, here again, we cannot conceive this conquest as a sufficient cause for a large migration of princes and peoples. Further, though military defeats may operate in some cases as a sufficient cause for migration, we need not specify any particular incident or period as specially favourable to such a contingency, for internecine wars and foreign invasions are almost constant factors in Indian history. Similar objections may be urged against the causes of other waves of periodical emigration ( wars of the Pālas, Pallavas etc. ) suggested by some other scholars.

A French savant has suggested that the progress of Buddhism gave a great impetus to the Indian colonization by the abolition of caste distinctions and the removal of the notion of untouchability which stood in the way of an orthodox Hindu's sojourn in foreign lands. As an evidence he cites the discovery of Buddhist images of an early date in the different colonies.<sup>11</sup>

This view, too, does not rest on a strong basis. In the first place the influence of Buddhism on the social condition and ideas of the laity, as opposed to the monks, is very imperfectly known. While it is true that caste distinctions and untouchability were unknown among the Buddhist monks, it is difficult to say how far the lay Buddhist community followed their example. The very fact that the caste-system not only continued, but assumed greater and greater rigidity during the very period that Buddhism was a dominant force in India, does not lend countenance to this view.

Further, it is a well-known fact that compared with Brahmanical religion, Buddhism had a very feeble hold in South-East Asia. This is clearly proved by epigraphic records and images actually found. The discovery of early Buddhist images does not prove the contrary, or even that the first colonists were Buddhists. For even in India itself the practice of making images was more in vogue among the Buddhists in the early period than among the followers of Brahmanical religion, and it has even been suggested that the latter adopted it in imitation of the former. It is natural, therefore, that as in India, Buddhist images

10 H. G. Q. Wales—*The Making of Greater India*, pp. 24 ff.

11 Coedès—*Etats*, 44.

would be more predominant than the Brahmanical images during the early centuries of the Christian era. But the oldest epigraphic records certainly prove the dominance of Brahmanical cults. Mention may be made of the fact that the dominance of Buddhism in the Hindu colonies in Central Asia, known from literary sources, is also clearly proved by archaeological remains. In South-East Asia, on the other hand, the archaeological remains clearly prove the dominance of Brahmanical religion. It is true that Buddhism had very important centres and played an important part in the spread of Hindu culture in this region, but there is no evidence that it had supplied the chief stimulus to the Hindu colonization there. If we have to give credit to any particular religion, it rightly belongs to both Brahmanical and Buddhist sects and, on the whole, the balance would probably incline to the former.

Far more plausible causes for the Hindu colonization are the improvements in navigation, particularly in the art of constructing large vessels which could carry six or seven hundred passengers. Of this we have clear evidence in Chinese texts. According to these texts, no Chinese vessels plied in the Indian Ocean at the beginning of the Christian era, but products of the western countries reached China by way of sea at the beginning of the first century B.C. and probably even somewhat earlier.<sup>11a</sup> We gather from a text of the first century A.D. that even then Chinese merchandise, and probably also Chinese merchants, had to be transhipped to the vessels of the barbarians which were big enough to carry six or seven hundred passengers. Who these barbarians were, has not been specified and there is no reason to think, as some European scholars do, that they were Persians, or that the technique of building large vessels originated in Persian gulf.<sup>12</sup> As a matter of fact, the known facts would certainly favour the presumption that the knowledge of the maritime developments referred to above should also be credited to the Indians, although we have no evidence from Indian sources. It is, however, easy to understand how such arts, even if they originate in certain countries, are quickly learnt by other countries in close contact with them. We know that, partly due to this reason and partly to the discovery of monsoon-winds by Hippalus, to be noted below, there was a large increase in the volume of trade and navigation between western countries and India in the early centuries

11a N. K. Sastri (*IHQ*, XIV, 387) refers to the passage of Pelliot. Houangche, the last point of the journey (in the above text), is identified by Ferrand with Kanchi; thus South India had relations with China in 2nd Century B.C. Reference may also be made to the find of a Chinese coin in Mysore whose dates are variously suggested to be 138 B.C., 502 A.D., 886 A.D.; the first appears more probable.

Cf. also *Suvarṇadvīpa* 1.70, f.n. 2.

12 Coedès—*Etats*, p. 44. But Pelliot who first notices this passage says that these big vessels were known to Persians, Indians and Chinese (*Etudes Asiatiques*, II, 255-7). For the account of the Chinese navigation, cf. Pelliot in *T'oung Pao*, XIII. 457; Ferrand in *JA*, 11, 13, pp. 451 ff.

of Christian era. We may hold that for similar reasons India, too, had developed her trade in the east about the same period, and this satisfactorily explains the beginnings of Hindu Colonization in South-East Asia during the early centuries of the Christian era.

The second question concerns the particular localities in India which supplied the Hindu colonists. The view that only the Indians of Malabar and Coromandel Coasts colonised South-east Asia by the sea-route was held by eminent scholars. In a book published more than twenty-five years ago, I combatted this view and tried to prove that North India, through the port of Tāmralipti in Bengal, had a fair share in this colonization. There has been much discussion on this point, and my esteemed friend Professor Nilakanta Sastri has opposed my view. This has led an eminent French scholar to remark, in a recent publication, that the Hindu scholars do not take a positive or detached view of the subject, and according as they belong to Madras or Calcutta, they attribute to the Tamil land or Bengal the honour of having colonized Greater India.<sup>13</sup> Although I do not regard this criticism a just one, it becomes a somewhat delicate task for me to discuss the problem. But nevertheless I cannot altogether avoid this discussion, and therefore state below the important data which must be taken into consideration before arriving at any conclusion.

It is a well-known fact that in early times the ships normally kept within sight of the shore and we know from the *Periplus of the Erythraean Sea*, that it was not until Hippalus's discovery of the monsoon winds, some time about 42 A.D., that there was any direct voyage from the western countries to the Indian coast. The same book, *Periplus*, does not clearly refer to any direct voyage between South India and the Malay Peninsula, but describes the coastal voyage from South India up to the Ganga, and then mentions the Malay Peninsula as near the mouth of this river. This hardly leaves any doubt that normally the voyage was all along the coast. This view is confirmed by Ptolemy who locates the *apheterium*, or the point of departure for ships bound for Malay Peninsula, immediately to the south of Paloura (near Gopalpur in Orissa). He evidently means that this is the point from where the vessels bound for Malay Peninsula "ceased to follow the littoral and entered the high seas." If, therefore, the normal course of the voyage between India and South-east Asia lay along the entire eastern coast, we cannot presume, except on very strong grounds, that only the people of Malabar and Coromandel took advantage of this long and tedious journey, and the people of North India merely looked on as idle spectators while the South Indian vessels passed through Paloura and Tāmralipti (Tamluk in Bengal), two excellent ports of embarkation at their disposal, the reputation of which goes back to the time of the Buddhist canonical literature. As

13 Coedès—*Etats.*, pp. 55-6.

mentioned before, the Jātakas and other texts, both Buddhist and Jain, refer to persons from various parts of North India sailing from Tāmralipti to Malay Peninsula and other localities beyond the sea.

More positive evidence is furnished by the Chinese text of the third century A.D. We know from these that a trader from Western India reached Fu-nan in the second quarter of the third century A.D. Having learnt from him detailed account of India, Fan, Chan, the king of Fu-nan, sent one of his relations as an ambassador to India. The latter embarked at Teu-Ki-li, probably the famous port of Takkola, reached the mouth of the Ganga, and then proceeded up the river for about 1000 miles. Now this account shows that the trader from Western India made a coasting voyage up to the mouth of the Ganga, which was in active intercourse with South-east Asia. If a direct voyage between South India and this region was quite familiar, and South India played the dominant role in this colonization, the West Indian trader would not have proceeded to the mouth of the Ganga, and the king of Fu-nan, who got all his information about India from this trader, would have probably sent his embassy to South India rather than to North India. In any case, it is certainly worthy of note that the first definite account that we possess of a political and maritime intercourse between India and South-east Asia refers to North and not South India, and implies the absence of any direct voyage between South India and South-east Asia.

We may briefly refer to a few other points bearing upon this problem. In the first place, we have various traditions current among the Hindu colonies regarding the locality from which their founders came. Nearly all of these refer to North India as their home.

Secondly, the Indian place-names which were adopted in the colonies belonged both to South and North India.

Thirdly, the alphabets which are used in the early inscriptions in these colonies do not show any South-Indian characteristics, and appear to be of North Indian origin.<sup>14</sup>

Lastly, the architecture and sculpture of the colonies show equally the influence of both North and South India. It may be mentioned in this connection that the storied roofs of temples in these colonies have been regarded by all European scholars as being derived from the Pallava style of architecture, and this has been advanced by them as the most important argument in favour of the South Indian origin of the Hindu Colonies. But they have mostly ignored the fact that the same style was prevalent in North India in much earlier time. This point will be fully discussed in a subsequent lecture dealing with architecture.

<sup>14</sup> I propounded this view in *BEFEO*, XXXII, 127. For further controversy cf. *Ibid*, XXXV, 233; *J. Or. Res.* X. 191; XI (51, 175).

It is perhaps not also quite irrelevant to the point at issue that the *Baudh-āyana Dharma-Sūtra*, while forbidding sea-voyage, permits it to Northerners on the ground that it was customary among them.

Some of the arguments advanced in support of South Indian origin of the Indian colonists appear to be weak. Thus Coedés mentions, with approval, the prominent role of the Kaunḍinya clan in South India originally suggested by B. R. Chatterji. The passages referred to by the latter mention only Kaunḍinya-*gotra*.<sup>15</sup> It is well-known that these *gotra*-names are really traced to mythical personages and have nothing to do with historical figures. It is as logical to locate Kaunḍinya in South India on this ground as to look for sage Bhāradvāja in South India because the Pallavas belonged to the Bhāradvāja-*gotra*.

On the whole, the only fair conclusion seems to be that the credit of colonization in South-east Asia belongs to India as a whole, and that while it is difficult to allot due shares to different parts of India, there is nothing to support the current view that South India had played the dominant part in it.

15 Coedés—*Etats*, p. 58; *JGIS*, VI. 139.

## LECTURE II

### THE FIRST PHASE OF HINDU COLONIZATION

In the preceding lecture we have traced the beginnings of Hindu Colonization in South-east Asia, and given a brief account of the country and the peoples with whom it came into contact. As we have seen, these peoples had not yet emerged from the neolithic culture, and there is no evidence that they had developed the idea of state beyond the stage of primitive tribal organization. All these were changed by the Hindu colonists. The essential elements of Hindu culture were absorbed by the peoples, and kingdoms, both big and small, were established throughout the region. It is beyond the scope of the present lecture to deal separately with the history of these kingdoms, and I propose to confine myself to a general review of the first five hundred years of Hindu Colonization.

The oldest Hindu colonial kingdom in this region, of which we possess any definite evidence, was established in the delta and lower valley of the Mekong river. The Chinese texts call it the kingdom of Fu-nan. This is the modern pronunciation of two Chinese Syllabic characters which were pronounced in the old days of the T'ang dynasty as *biu-nām*. This is a Chinese transcription of the old Khmer word *bnam*, modern *phnom*, meaning mountain. The rulers of this country called themselves 'king of the mountain', *parvatabhūpāla* or or *śaila-rāja* in Sanskrit,<sup>1</sup> and *Kurun bnam* in Khmer, from which the Chinese derived the name of the country.

The old capital of Fu-nan was probably Vyādhapura, 'the city of hunter', mentioned in a later inscription. The Chinese call it T'o-mu which is perhaps a transcription of the Khmer word *dmak* or *dalmak* which has the same meaning as Vyādhapura. The location of this city is not definitely known. Pelliot identified it with Angkor Borei, but Coedès places it further to the north-east, on the other side of the Mekong, at the foot of the hillock called Ba Phnom, near the village of Banam, and thinks that these two place-names have reserved the memory of the ancient name of the kingdom. According to the *History of the*

1 According to L. Finot (*J. A.* CCX, 486; *Melange S. Levi*, 203) Fu-nan corresponds to Kurun bnam i.e. king of mountain, a title which he identifies with the expression *parvatabhūpāla* referred to in the Han Chei Temple Inscription (No. 12, v. 10). As Coedès has drawn important conclusions from this by way of associating Śailendras with Fu-nan (*JGIS*, I. 67) it is necessary to point out that the expression *parvata-bhūpalān* means kings of mountains i.e. hilly regions and may be taken in a general sense without reference to any particular king, far less that of Fu-nan. The same thing may be said of the expression *Śaila-rāja* in the unpublished inscription of Kṣk Prah Kot, referred to by Coedès.

*Liang Dynasty* the capital city was about 100 miles<sup>2</sup> from the sea. This is approximately the distance between Ba Phnom and Oc-eo whose archaeological remains described in the preceding lecture, seem to indicate that it was an emporium of the foreign traders, if not the actual port itself.

Reference has already been made to the tradition according to which this kingdom was founded by a Brāhmaṇa named Kauṇḍinya who defeated and married the Nāga princess Somā. This tradition was first recorded by the Chinese ambassador K'ang T'ai who visited Fu-nan between A.D. 245 and 250, and wrote a short account of the kingdom. We learn from this that Kauṇḍinya was succeeded by his son and grandson, and one of his successors, called by the Chinese Huen P'an huang, died at the advanced age of ninety. His son and successor left the cares of government to his general Fan-che-man who was elected king by the people after the death of his master.

A great deal of importance attaches to this king. As his successor sent an embassy to China in A.D. 243, Fan-che-man must have reigned about the first quarter of the third century A.D. This is the first fixed point in the chronology, not only of Fu-nan, but also of the Hindu colonization in South-east Asia. For, from the details noted above regarding the history of Fu-nan since its foundation by Kauṇḍinya, his reign cannot be placed later than the first century A.D. As the Hindu colonists reached almost the furthest point in Indo-China and established a kingdom there in the first century A.D., we must push back the beginnings of intercourse between India and South-east Asia considerably before this period to the centuries immediately preceding the Christian era.

Fan-che-man was a powerful ruler and a great conqueror. He built up a powerful navy and attacked the neighbouring kingdoms. Ten of these states, lying within a distance of about a thousand miles,<sup>3</sup> became vassals of Fu-nan. Fan-che-man assumed the title "Great king of Fu-nan" which he fully deserved, and he may be regarded as the founder of the first Hindu colonial empire in South-east Asia.

The vassal states of Fu-nan are named in the Chinese text, but they cannot all be identified with any degree of certainty. One of these, K'iu-tu, has been taken to correspond to Kattigara of Ptolemy and located in Cochin-China. Another, Tien-Suen, mentioned in the preceding lecture, must have been in the Malay Peninsula. On the whole, considering the Chinese statement about the extent of Fan-che-man's conquests, his empire may be said to have comprised nearly the whole of Siam and Cambodia and parts of Laos and Malay Peninsula.

2 500 *li*, according to the Chinese account. The *li* is equivalent to about 1/6 of a mile (Watters—*On Yuan Chwang*).

Coedès takes a *li* to be equivalent to 576 metre *i.e.* one-third of a mile (*Etats*, p. 71, f.n. 3).

3 Five or six thousand *li* (see preceding note).



The history of Fan-che-man proves the existence of quite a large number of states in South-east Asia about this time. From other sources also we know the names of Hindu colonial kingdoms dating back to this early period. It is not unlikely that most of the vassal states of Fu-nan, if not all of them, were Hindu Colonies.

But before we refer to them, we may continue the history of Fu-nan. After the death of Fan-che-man the throne was usurped by his nephew and general Fan-chan. He sent an embassy to India, and the ruler of India also sent an embassy in return. Fan-chan also sent an embassy to China in A.D. 243. Fu-nan thus entered into political relations with the two powerful kingdoms of his time.

Fan-chan was assassinated by Fan-Chang, who in his turn was also murdered by his general Fan Siun. During his reign two Chinese ambassadors K'ang T'ai and Chu Ying visited Fu-nan and they met there Chen-song, one of the envoys sent by the king of India. Both the Chinese ambassadors wrote books on Fu-nan, and K'ang also recorded a brief account of India as reported by Chen-song.

Fan Siun sent no less than four embassies to China between A.D. 268 and 287. Nevertheless, in alliance with the ruler of the neighbouring kingdom of Champā, he led incursions into the Chinese province of Tonkin.

For nearly three quarters of a century, we do not hear anything further of Fu-nan from the Chinese texts. The next reference is to an embassy from Fu-nan sent by Tien-chu-tan. As Tien-chu is the Chinese name for India, the royal name has been interpreted as Hindu (*i.e.*, India) Chandana. According to S. Levi, the name and designation of the king indicate that he came from India and belonged to the Kuṣāṇa family. He thinks that after the Kuṣāṇas were ousted by Samudra-gupta, some members of the royal family might have migrated to the over-sea colonies to try their fortune. But all this seems to be too speculative for purposes of sober history.

Not long after the usurpation of Chandana we hear of the arrival of a Brāhmaṇa from India named Kaunḍinya. Directed by a supernatural voice to go and rule in Fu-nan, he reached this kingdom through P'an-p'an, a locality in the Malay Peninsula. The people of Fu-nan elected him king, and he introduced Indian laws, manners and customs.

This tradition is of more than passing interest. In the first place nobody can mistake its resemblance to the older legend of the first Kaunḍinya. We are told that this second Kaunḍinya came directly from India, and we may presume that the same was true of the first Kaunḍinya, though this is nowhere clearly stated.

Put in a proper historical setting this second Kaunḍinya has every claim to be regarded as an historical personality. His story undoubtedly proves that

there was a fresh wave of Indian Colonization which was probably much stronger than the first and exercised greater influence upon the culture of the people. It is said of the first Kauṇḍinya that he found his wife, the Nāga princess Somā, in a nude state, and made her wear clothes. But it was long before the people gave up the old habit. The Chinese ambassador K'ang T'ai, who visited Fu-nan about the middle of the third century A.D., observed that the men went about naked but king Fan Siun stopped this indecent habit. It would thus appear that in spite of the efforts of the first Kauṇḍinya, Indian culture did not make any deep impression upon the people for nearly three or four centuries till a fresh wave of Indian colonists attained greater success about the end of the fourth or beginning of the fifth century A.D. As will be noted later, a strong wave of Indian culture swept over nearly the whole of South-east Asia about this period.

It may be noted that all the kings of Fu-nan beginning from Fan-che-man, who succeeded the last descendant of the first Kauṇḍinya up to the accession, of Hindu Chandana, had Fan as part of their names. It is generally supposed that this was the Chinese transcription of 'Varman', the usual name-ending of a Kṣatriya in India. Recently a scholar<sup>4</sup> has suggested that it was an ethnic title, denoting an indigenous person as opposed to a Hindu immigrant. According to this theory the Hindu colonization spent its force and there was a revival of indigenous influence at the beginning of the third century A.D. This continued for two centuries till a fresh wave of colonization, under Kauṇḍinya II, planted the Hindu culture once again.

Whatever we may think of the theory as a whole, specially the new interpretation of Fan, there seems to be no doubt that there was a set-back to Hindu culture and revival of some obnoxious indigenous habits and practices during the third and fourth centuries A.D. But the Hinduism introduced by Kauṇḍinya II took deep root in the soil, and continued in unabated strength, till it transformed the indigenous culture almost beyond recognition.

Henceforth the rulers of Fu-nan had clear Sanskrit names. The name of king Ch'e-li-t'o-pa-mo who sent embassies to China in A.D. 434, 435 and 438, is obviously a Chinese transliteration of an Indian name like Śrī-Indra-varman or Śreṣṭha-varman. The next king, mentioned in Chinese sources, is called Cho-ye-pa-mo, whose family name was Kauṇḍinya. The Chinese form evidently stands for Jaya-varman, who was a descendant of Kauṇḍinya II.

This Jaya-varman is the earliest king of Fu-nan whose name occurs in Sanskrit inscriptions to which reference will be made later. His reign, extending at least from A.D. 484 to 514, marks the beginning of what may be called the truly historical period of Fu-nan, as we know a great many details about him and can trace the continuous history of the country up to modern times.

4 R. Stein in *Bull. Centre Sinol, Peking*, cf. *Coedès Etats*, p. 71, f.n. 1.

Before doing so, however, we must take note of other Hindu kingdoms that flourished during the period under review.

The Hindu kingdom nearest to Fu-nan and most closely associated with it was Kambuja. It was originally a small kingdom, occupying the territory round Vat Phu hill near Bassac in Laos, in the north-eastern corner of Cambodia. According to local tradition it was founded by Kambu Svāyambhuva, a king of Āryadeśa, *i.e.*, India. Grieved at the death of his wife Merā, whom the great God Śiva himself gave to him, he betook himself to the wild desert of Cambodia in order to put an end to his life, but met there a Nāga king equally devoted to Śiva. He married the daughter of the Nāga king who by his magic power, turned, the arid land into a beautiful country like Āryadeśa.

It would appear that unlike the Hindu colonists of Fu-nan those of Kambuja probably came by an overland route through Siam and Laos. The earliest historical kings of Kambuja were Śrūta-varman and his son Śreṣṭha-varman who founded a royal family. The rulers of this family are said to have delivered their country from bondage. This obviously means that Kambuja was originally subordinate to another power, and one or more descendants of Śreṣṭha-varman succeeded in throwing off the yoke. It is generally believed that Fu-nan was the suzerain power. But it is now known that a king named Devānika, probably a ruler of Champā, was in possession of the region found Bassac before the end of the fifth century A.D., and he might have been the suzerain of Kambuja. But we do not know either the date of the foundation of Kambuja or its conquest by Fu-nan or Champā and liberation from her yoke. It had probably freed itself before the middle of the sixth century A.D. when king Bhava-varman acquired it and founded a new royal family.

To the east of Fu-nan and Kambuja lay the Hindu kingdom of Champā in the central and southern part of what is now called Annam. We have no direct or definite evidence of the foundation of Hindu Colonies in this region, such as we possess about Fu-nan in the Chinese accounts. But there are very important considerations in favour of the view that the Hindu colonies were established in the province of Quang Nam about the first century A.D. The territory immediately to its north, comprising Tonkin, formed a part of the Chinese empire and was ruled by one or more Governors. We learn from the Chinese sources that in A.D. 137 the southern part of this region was attacked by a band of barbarians called Kiu-lien and the Governor had great difficulty in inducing them to retreat. In A.D. 192, an indigenous official of Siang-lin, named Kiu-lien, in the southern part of the Chinese territory, revolted and founded a kingdom called by the Chinese Lin-yi. This may be a geographical or ethnic name, but it was by this name that the Chinese historians henceforth designated the Hindu kingdom of Champā. The common name Kiu-lien, though written in

different characters, seems to connect the inroad of A.D. 137 with the successful rebellion of A.D. 192.

It is evident that the local people, who are called Chams after the name of the kingdom, Champā, were infused with a fresh vigour and new life in the first century A.D., and there is hardly any doubt that it was due to the settlement of Hindu colonists among them. This is proved by the discovery in this region of a fine bronze image of Buddha of the Amarāvati school datable in the second or third century A.D. The scholars are unanimous in their view that the kingdom of Siang-lin, founded by Kiu-lien in A.D. 192, was the nucleus of the Hindu kingdom of Champā. It is interesting to note that in A.D. 280 the Chinese governor reported that the kingdom of Lin-yi touched the frontiers of Fu-nan in the south, that the peoples of the countries were allied, and far from submitting to China, they made incursions against the Chinese territory. This seems to indicate that the two neighbouring Hindu colonies of Fu-nan and Champā maintained a close political association and acted in concert against their common enemy China.

It is not easy to form a clear idea of the common boundary between Fu-nan and Champā in the third century A.D. The most important evidence in this respect is an inscription engraved on two faces of a block of granite, found close to the village of Vo-Chanh, near Nha-trang in the province of Khanh-Hoa, in southern Annam.<sup>5</sup> The inscription is composed in Sanskrit and written in an Indian script of the second or third century A.D.<sup>6</sup> As very little remains of the first seven lines of the record, and portions of other lines are also lost, it is difficult to understand its real purport. The extant portion refers to the royal family of Śrī Māra and records some donations to friends and kinsmen by a king of this family. The personal name of the king nowhere appears in the portion preserved but reference is made to his assembly (*sadasi*) and his first conquest. (*prathama-vijaya*).

As we have independent evidence of the foundation of the kingdom of Champā in A.D. 192, and Vo-Chanh is situated in a region which formed a well-known centre of this kingdom throughout the historical period, Śrī-Māra was naturally taken to be the first historical Hindu king, if not the actual founder, of the Hindu kingdom of Champā. But Finot propounded the view that the region Vo-Chanh was a vassal state of Fu-nan, and Coedès further improved upon it by identifying Śrī-Māra with king Fan-che-man of Fu-nan, mentioned above.

5 Champā, Ins. No. 1.

6 This is the generally accepted date. But Dr. D. C. Sircar refers the inscription to the fourth century A.D. (*JGIS*, VI, 53). Cf. also *IHQ*, XVI, 484; XVII, 107 for controversy over the date.

We should remember in this connection that the kingdom of Champā was sufficiently strong and enjoyed a great deal of prestige in Chinese eyes even during the first half of the third century A.D. Some time between 220 and 230 A.D. the king of Champā sent an ambassador to the Chinese governor of Tonkin on the invitation of the latter. In A.D. 248 the Cham navy attacked Tonkin, ravaged several towns, including even the provincial capital, and defeated the fleet that was sent against it. At last a treaty was concluded by which a portion of the Chinese domain corresponding to modern Thua Thien was ceded to Champā. Similar Cham aggressions were carried on from A.D. 270 to 280, this time in alliance with Fu-nan, and the Chinese were reduced to great straits.

Champā was a long narrow strip of territory, whose breadth nowhere exceeded sixty or seventy miles. Bereft of its southern part it would be reduced to too small a size and its natural resources would be very poor. It is to be seriously considered whether such a petty kingdom, confined to the central part of Annam, could carry on a protracted struggle against the Chinese, as mentioned above, and maintain diplomatic relations on a basis of equality with both China and Fu-nan.

It is also to be remembered that the region round Vo-Chanh, under the name Kuṭṭhāra, formed an integral part of Champā down to the latest days of her history, and Kambuja laid no claim to it even in the heyday of its glory. Until therefore very convincing argument is brought forward we should regard Śrī Māra as a ruler of Champā. No such evidence is, however, forthcoming. The theory propounded by Finot was put forward merely as a possibility,<sup>7</sup> and he admitted later, that his theory was as likely as the current view that Śrī-Māra was a Hindu king of Champā.<sup>8</sup> The identification of Fan-che-man and Sri-Māra was proposed by Coedés simply on the ground that the former is known to have made extensive conquests. This is, however, a very weak ground, and Coedés himself admits that 'man' is not, correctly speaking, a regular transcription of 'Māra', though this does not seem to be impossible.<sup>9</sup>

We may, therefore, recognise Śrī-Māra as the first Hindu king of Champā, and as he is definitely said in the Vo-Chanh inscription to have been the founder of a royal family, he may be identified with Kiu-lien, mentioned in the Chinese account as having founded an independent kingdom in A.D. 192.<sup>10</sup> It would then follow that almost from the very beginning the Hindu kingdom of Champā comprised the central, and a part, if not the whole, of southern Annam.

7 JA, CCX. 486.

8 BEFEO, XXVIII. 287.

9 IHQ, XVI. 486.

10 M. S. Sugimoto explains that two variants of Kiu-lien (founder of the kingdom of Champā), given in two Chinese texts, are translations of the name Māra or the 'Evil One' (*Ibid.*).

The Chinese history has preserved the names of several kings of Champā. They steadily pursued the aggressive policy of expansion towards the north at the cost of the Chinese province, and by the middle of the fourth century A.D., the northern boundary of Champā was carried to the Hoan Sonh mountains, the furthest limit it ever reached. But the Emperor of China was not likely to suffer, in silence, these aggressions from a small state like Champā, and protracted fights between the two marked the subsequent history of Champā. In A.D. 446, the Chinese led a successful invasion up to the heart of the kingdom and captured the capital city named Champā-pura. After pillaging the city and country the victorious Chinese army returned with a rich booty of very precious objects.

The names of the early kings of Champā are mostly known only in their Chinese form. Each of these begins with Fan, and this has been held to correspond to Sanskrit title 'Varman' which was the epithet of almost every Cham king in later times. Recently a scholar has opposed this view, as noted above, and he takes Fan to be the designation of an indigenous clan. But some of the kings, whose names ending in 'varman' are known from Sanskrit inscriptions, must have flourished during the same period, and this supports the equation of Fan with Varman.

The first king, after Śrī-Māra, whose name occurs in Sanskrit inscription is Śrī Bhadra-varman. The characters of his inscriptions may be referred to c. 400 A.D., and he has been identified with Fan-hu-ta of the Chinese Chronicles who was a great general and increased the power and prestige of his kingdom.<sup>11</sup>

Whatever we might think of this identification, Bhadra-varman must be regarded as a very important king. His full name was Dharma-mahārāja Śrī Bhadra-varman. He built a temple of Śiva at Myson and called the God, after his own name, Bhadreśvarasvāmi. This practice, well-known in India, was almost universally adopted in Champā in later times, and the temple of Bhadreśvara-svāmi became the national sanctuary of Champā for nearly a thousand years. The king was a scholar and was versed in the four Vedas.

According to the Chinese Chronicles Fan-hu-ta was succeeded in A.D. 413 by his son Ti-chen who abdicated the throne and went to India. This king has been identified with king Gaṅgārāja who is mentioned in a Sanskrit inscription as having abdicated the throne in order to spend his last days on the Gaṅgā.

This inscription refers to a royal family who traced their claim to the throne through Gaṅgārāja. It refers to several kings viz. Manoratha-varman, Rudra-varman, Śambhu-varman, Kandarpa-dharma and Prabhāsa-dharma. Śambhu-

11 Vogel assigns these inscriptions to a somewhat earlier date (*BKI*, Vol. 74, p. 232), and in that case Bhadra-varman may be identified with Fan-hu-ta's father Fan-Fo, whose name may be regarded as a Chinese transcription of the Sanskrit name,

varman stopped the payment of customary tribute to China, and though he renewed it in A.D. 595, the Chinese army invaded Champā ten years later. The capital city was pillaged and the Chinese took about 10,000 prisoners and cut off their ears. The victorious Chinese general took the golden tablets of eighteen kings who had ruled over Champā before Śambhu-varman, and 1350 Buddhist works. He also carried away as prisoners some musicians from Fu-nan who carried to the Imperial Court the musical arts of India.

Śambhu-varman made peace with China by payment of customary tribute. His grandson Prabhāsa-dharma was killed with all members of his family in A.D. 645 and a period of anarchy and civil war followed. Evidently the king of Kambuja had a share in all these intrigues. In any case the throne of Champā was occupied, some time before A.D. 653, by Prakāśadharma-Vikrānta-varman whose mother Śarvāṇī was a daughter of king Iśāna-varman of Kambuja, and father, Jagaddharma, was member of the royal family of Champā, who had fled to Kambuja.

In addition to Fu-nan, Kambuja and Champā, there were several other Hindu colonies in Indo-China, whose existence is proved by archaeological remains and other evidences, though no detailed account is available.

From its geographical position the Malay Peninsula appears to have been the cradle of Indian civilization in South-east Asia. Some of the place-names in this region, mentioned in the Pāli canonical work *Niddesa* and Ptolemy's *Geography*, are pure Sanskrit words and prove the settlements of the Hindu there in or before the second century A.D. Takkola, described as the first mart in the Peninsula by Ptolemy, is also mentioned in the *Niddesa* and *Milinda-pañha*. It is usually identified with Takua Pa on the western coast of the Isthmus of Kra, but some scholars place it a little further to the south, at Trang.<sup>11a</sup> It is probably to be identified with the port called T'eu kiu-li by the Chinese where the ambassador from Fu-nan embarked for India. Tamali or Tambalingam mentioned in the *Niddesa* is the same as Tāmbraṅgam mentioned in a Sanskrit inscription. This inscription, referred on palaeographic grounds to the sixth century at the latest, locates the colony in the Ligor region. As we shall see later, it existed as an important kingdom down to the 13th century A.D.

Another Hindu Colony at Tien-Suen has been referred to above.

One of the oldest Hindu kingdoms in Malay Peninsula is mentioned in the Chinese *History of the Liang Dynasty* (502-556 A.D.) as Lang-ya-su and under slightly varying forms in Chinese texts of the seventh and twelfth century A.D. It is the same as Lankasuka mentioned in the Javanese and Malay Chronicles, a name which has survived till our own times as that of a small branch of the Perak river. It lay across the Malay Peninsula touching both

<sup>11a</sup> cf. *J. Mal. Br. R. A. S.* XXII, 25.

the Bay of Bengal and the Gulf of Siam, thus controlling the shorter trade-route to the east,<sup>12</sup> to which reference has been made above. According to local traditions preserved in the Chinese accounts of the sixth century A.D., the kingdom was founded four hundred years ago *i.e.*, about the second century A.D. The king of this country extolled the emperor of China by saying, among other things, that the precious Sanskrit was generally known in his land. This indicates it to be a Hindu colony. Further evidence is furnished by the detailed account preserved in the *History of the Liang Dynasty*. We are told that the king grew jealous or suspicious of a member of the royal family on account of his great popularity and drove him out. The latter took refuge in India and was married to the eldest daughter of the king. On the death of the king of Lang-ya-su the great officers of the State recalled the exile and offered him the throne. He died after a reign of more than 20 years and was succeeded by his son, Bhagadatta. He sent an ambassador named Āditya to China in A.D. 515 and repeated the embassies in A.D. 523 and 531. A further embassy was sent in A.D. 568.

Another Hindu Colony in this region is named by the Chinese P'an-p'an. The second Kauṇḍinya passed through this place on his way to Fu-nan. We learn from a passage preserved in Ma Twan-lin's encyclopaedic work that many Brāhmaṇas came to this country from India in order to profit by the munificence of the king who held them in high favour. It sent an embassy to China, during the period 424-453 A.D.

Another Hindu State in Malay Peninsula of which we get some account in the Chinese annals is Pa-hoang ( or Po-huang ) which has been identified with Pahang. In A.D. 449 an embassy was sent to China by its king whose Chinese name seems to correspond to Sari-Pala-Varma. Mention is made of two great historians of this State who were honoured by the Chinese Emperor.

The Chinese annals refer to a kingdom called Kan-to-li or Kin-to-li situated in an island in the southern sea. The exact locality of this kingdom cannot be definitely ascertained, but it was probably in the Malay Peninsula. Several kings of this country sent embassies to China in the fifth and sixth century A.D. The names of the kings and envoys are Indian, and the customs and manners of the people are said to be similar to those of Kambuja and Champā. So this also seems to be Hindu colony.

The existence of many other Hindu settlements in the Malay Peninsula may be inferred from a large number of inscriptions and other archaeological remains. These inscriptions are mostly fragmentary and do not give any connected meaning. But indirectly they convey information of great historical importance. These inscriptions are written in Sanskrit language and Indian alphabets of the fourth or fifth century A.D. Seven of them were found in the



centre and four in the northern part of Province Wellesley. Five of them were found in Ligor, two in Chaiya and one each in Keddah and Takua Pa. Two of these inscriptions distinctly refer to a Buddhist creed.

Remains of Brahmanical and Buddhist shrines and images of gods, some of which are of the Gupta style, have been found in Keddah, Perak and other places. Special mention may be made of a Cornelian seal found at Kaula Selinsing in Perak engraved with the name of a Hindu prince Śrī Viṣṇu-varman, in characters of the fifth century A.D. Slightly later in date is an inscription found near Keddah containing three verses, from a Sūtra of the Mādhyamika School.<sup>13</sup>

It may be safely concluded from the above that the Hindu had established colonies in the northern, eastern and western sides of the Malay Peninsula by at least fourth and fifth centuries A.D. An important Buddhist colony was that of Nakhon Śrī Dhammarat which probably built the great *stūpa* and part of the fifty temples which surrounded it. A large number of votive tablets have been found in the caves inhabited by the Buddhists. The inscriptions on some of them have been referred to the fourth or fifth century A.D. Some of the colonies were mainly agricultural but others prospered by the exploitation of tin and gold-mines. The old pits dug in the mine-fields are still clearly distinguished from later ones by a special technique.

To the north of Malay Peninsula, in the Lower Menam Valley, flourished the Hindu Kingdom of Dvāravatī. It is mentioned by Hiuen Tsang in the seventh century A.D., but there is no definite evidence of its existence at an earlier period. The archaeological remains at Si Tep (Śrī Deva), Pra Pathom and Pong Tuk, prove Hindu settlements in the fourth and fifth centuries A.D., if not earlier still, and these may belong to the old Hindu colony of Dvāravatī. On the basis of these remains Coedès has located the old Kingdom of Dvāravatī in the area extending from Lopburi in the north to Ratburi in the west and Prachin in the east. An inscription at Lopburi in the archaic Mon language indicates that the basic population of Dvāravatī belonged to that race. This is supported by the tradition that the Mon settlement of Haripuñjaya (Lampan) further north was founded by queen Chammadevi of Lopburi.

The Hinduized Mons must have spread to the Lower Menam Valley from their base in Lower Burma. Here they had a number of powerful settlements known collectively as Ramanañadesa. This was evidently derived from the racial name Ramen, found in an eleventh century inscription, from which through the medieval, form 'Raman', is derived the modern word 'Mon' as the designation of the people. The Mons are also known as Talaings. This name probably denoted at first the Hindu colonists who came from Telingana in India and was ultimately applied to the whole people.

According to tradition current among the people of Pegu in Lower Burma, Indian colonists from the lower courses of the rivers Krishna and Godavari had at a remote time crossed the sea and formed settlements in the delta of the Irawadi and on the adjoining coast. A semi-mythical legend traces the foundation of the kingdom of Thaton or Sudhammavati to two sons of king Tissa. A list of fifty-nine kings who reigned there is given in the chronicles. It is further recorded that two sons of the king of Thaton, named Thamala (Śyāmala) and Vimala, being excluded from succession to the throne, founded a new city called Bogo or Pegu, known also as Harisavati. It is incidentally mentioned that Hindu strangers came in ships and invaded Pegu but were repulsed. There were altogether 17 kings in this dynasty, the last of whom, Tissa, ascended the throne in 761 A.D.

According to traditions current among the Burmese, Abhirāja, a prince of the Śākya clan of Kapilavastu, marched with an army to Upper Burma, founded the city of Sankissa (Tagaung) on the Upper Irawadi, and set himself up as the king of the surrounding region. After thirty-one generations had ruled, a second band of Kṣatriyas from the Gangetic valley occupied the kingdom. After sixteen generations of the new dynasty had ruled, the kingdom was overrun by the barbarians, but the elder son of the king founded a new kingdom with his capital near modern Prome. His son founded the great city of Śrīkṣetra nearby and made it his capital. After eighteen kings had ruled there, a civil war broke out among the three constituent tribes, viz. Pyu, Kanran and Mramma. The Pyus having gained the contest the Kanrans went to Arakan. But the Pyus themselves were defeated by the Mons or Talaings and the supremacy passed to the Mramma, from which is derived the modern name Burma. The capital was removed to the city of Pagan.

These traditional accounts cannot, of course, be regarded as historical. But they contain a nucleus of historical facts such as the settlement of Indian colonists among the Pyus, Mrammas and Karens, who belonged to the same race, and the Mons belonging to a different race; the foundation of the Hindu kingdoms of Tagaung, Arakan, Śrīkṣetra, Thaton and Pegu; and finally, the destruction of the Hinduized Pyu kingdom of Śrīkṣetra by the Mons of Pegu leading to the foundation of Pagan where the Hinduized Mrammas or Burmas came to occupy the supreme place.

No reliance can be placed on the chronology of these traditions according to which the first Hindu kingdom at Tagaung was founded many centuries before Buddha. There is, however, hardly any doubt that Burma, which was the nearest region to India, must have been colonized long before the first century A.D. when the Hindu colonists spread all over South-east Asia and advanced as far as Cambodja. Unfortunately, we do not possess any evidence for this early colonization of Burma. But the settlement of Indians in Burma before the second century A.D. is proved by Sanskrit place-names mentioned by Ptolemy

which have been located with a tolerable degree of certainty in Burma. This is supported by the discovery of isolated Brāhmī alphabets of India on stones in Burma.

We know from the Chinese chronicles a great deal of the tribe called Pyu in the Burmese tradition. The earliest Chinese notices of Burma, going back to the third century A.D., refer to the people as P'iao which undoubtedly stands for Pyu. Hiuen Tsang refers to the kingdom of Śrīkṣetra as the first great Hindu kingdom beyond the frontier of East India. Round about this ancient site (modern Prome) have been found inscribed plaques containing canonical texts in Pāli which have been referred to about A.D. 500. We have also Sanskrit inscriptions of the Pyus dating probably from the seventh century A.D. But our knowledge of a connected history of Burma goes back only to the tenth century A.D.

After this general survey of the Hindu colonies in the mainland we may now pass on to the islands of the Malay Archipelago. Among these Java seems to have been known to the Indians from a very early period. The Sanskrit form of its name is referred to in the *Rāmāyaṇa* and mentioned by Ptolemy. Reference has already been made to the possible foundation of a Hindu kingdom in Java towards the end of the first or the beginning of the second century A.D. The account of Fa-hien, who visited the island in A.D. 414-5, leaves no doubt that the Hindus were settled there for a very long time. But the first positive evidence of a Hindu kingdom in Java is furnished by four rock inscriptions found within the boundaries of the Residency of Batavia *i.e.*, in the western part of the island. These inscriptions refer to a king Pūrṇa-varman whose capital was the city of Tārumā. His grandfather is called *rājarsi* (royal sage) and another ancestor, probably his father, is given the epithet *rājādhirāja*. The latter is said to have dug Chandrabhāgā, evidently a canal, which reached the ocean after passing by the capital city. In the twenty-second year of his reign, Pūrṇa-varman himself dug another canal called the Gomatī river. On palaeographic considerations Pūrṇa-varman may be placed in the fifth or sixth century A.D.

Nothing is known about the extent of Pūrṇa-varman's kingdom beyond the area covered by his inscriptions, or of its history after him. But it appears from the Chinese chronicles that quite a large number of petty kingdoms flourished in the island in the sixth century or earlier still. The annals of the T'ang period (A.D. 618-906) mention Ho-ling as the name of the kingdom of Java. Ho-ling is generally regarded as a Chinese transcription of Kāliṅga, the name of a well-known region in the eastern coast of India.

The advance of the Hindu colonists to Central Java is proved by a Sanskrit inscription engraved on a large boulder near the famous spring called Tuk Mas, to the north-east of Magelang. This inscription is perhaps slightly later in date than the records of Pūrṇa-varman. A Buddha image of Amarāvati style

found at Jember in Eastern Java proves the further penetration of the Hindus by the second or third century A.D.

In the neighbouring island of Sumatra flourished the kingdom of Śrī-Vijaya. Some scholars find a reference to it in the Chinese translation of a Buddhist *sūtra*. As this translation was made in A.D. 392, this view, if accepted, would vouch for the existence of Śrī-Vijaya in the fourth century A.D. But it is not till seventh century A.D. that Śrī-Vijaya came into prominence and its history will be treated later. There were probably other Hindu kingdoms in Sumatra before this period but we do not know anything definite about them. A Buddha image of the Amarāvati style has been found on the rock called Seguntang at Palembang. There was also a Hindu kingdom in the island of Bali to the east of Java.<sup>14</sup> The *History of the Liang Dynasty* (A.D. 502-556) says that the king's family name is Kaundinya and it was claimed that the wife of Śuddhodana was a daughter of a king of this country. According to the *History of the Sui Dynasty* (A.D. 581-617), the king's family name is Ch'a-ri-ya-ka, the first two characters of which are a common Chinese transcription of the word Kṣatriya. Evidently, the kings of Bali claimed to belong to the Kṣatriya caste. The kingdom sent embassies to China in A.D. 518, 523, 616 and 630.

Hindu colonies were also established in the large island of Borneo. This is proved by seven inscriptions<sup>15</sup> found in the district of Kutei, at Muara Kamam, on the Mahakam river. The remains of a Chinese jonk, found in the locality, mark it to be an important sea-port in old days, and this perhaps facilitated the Hindu settlement in this region.

The inscriptions were engraved on *yūpas* or sacrificial pillars set up by the Brāhmaṇas who acted as priests in the sacrifices performed by king Mūla-varman son of Aśva-varman, and grandson of king Kuṇḍuṅga. Aśva-varman is said to have been the originator of the family.

Hindu antiquities have been found in other places in East Borneo, the most notable finds, including images of a large number of gods, being those in a cave at Kombeng which is situated considerably to the north of Muara Kaman. Archaeological remains of the Hindu colonies have also been found in Western Borneo at various places on or near the banks of the Kapuas river. These include more than ten inscriptions on stone and a large number of inscribed golden plates. The standing Buddhas of Gupta style have been found at Sambas. It has been suggested that Barhiṇadvīpa mentioned in the *Vāyu Purāṇa* refers to Borneo.<sup>16</sup>

14 This account is based on the presumption that Po-li, mentioned in the Chinese texts, refers to the island of Bali. For different view on this point cf. *Suvarṇadvīpa*, I. 133.

15 Four of these inscriptions are referred to in *Suvarṇadvīpa* I. 126. For the remaining three inscriptions Cf. *JGIS*, XII. 14.

16 Sastri—*Sri Vijaya*, p. 23.

We have no positive evidence of the establishment of Hindu kingdoms in any other island during this early period. But the discovery of a Buddha image of Amarāvati style at Sempaga in the island of Celebes shows that the Hindus had settled there by the second or third century A.D.

Hindu antiquities have been found in other islands, too. But their dates are unknown.

We have now broadly reviewed the state of Hindu colonies in South-east Asia. We may sum up the result by saying that Hindu colonists turned their attention to this region as early as the beginning of the Christian era, if not earlier still. Long before that, adventurous spirits had boldly plied the ocean to explore these unknown lands, undeterred by the risks of voyage in uncharted sea, the bands of pirates that infested the maritime route, and the cruel savage tribes that sometimes inhabited the regular ports or forced landing places. When we read of these in the accounts of actual voyages in later times, and find a graphic description of the ship-wrecked passengers or those hovering between life and death for days together in small wooden vessels in high tempestuous seas, we can realise how the Hindus of that by-gone Period, unlike their modern representatives and uninfluenced by the Śāstric injunctions to the contrary, braved the perils of the sea and showed a spirit of adventure and exploration that might differ degree, but not in kind, from that which lay at the root of European explorations of the modern age culminating in polar expeditions.

As in later days, the perilous voyages of pioneers paid rich dividends to their successors, more and more traders were attracted by the lure of the gold, silver and spices for which the region was famous, and physical obstacles proved as unavailing to them as to gold-seekers of a later age. That the greed of traders was the chief incentive to these early voyages is abundantly proved by the Sanskrit geographical names in this region such as Suvarṇa-bhūmi, Suvarṇa-dvīpa, Yava-dvīpa, Karpūra-dvīpa, Nārikela-dvīpa.

As soon as the Hindu traders made these lands familiar in their own country, others followed in their wake, including Brāhmaṇas and Buddhists, fired by the missionary spirit, impoverished Kṣatriyas hopping by their prowess and military knowledge to restore their fortunes, and artisans and craftsmen trying to improve their social status and material welfare by the exercise of superior skill. These motley crowds went in hundreds and thousands and settled in different regions among the primitive inhabitants.

Such settlements must have been widely spread all over the region by the beginning of the Christian era, and we have already described the process by which they grew into small kingdoms. Although details are lacking in many cases, it follows from what has been stated above that within two to three hundred

years nearly the whole of Indo-China and Indonesia, comprising Burma, Siam, Malay Peninsula, Cambodia and Annam in the mainland and the islands of Sumatra, Java, Bali, Borneo, Celebes and perhaps many others were dotted over with such kingdoms and settlements of a less organised character. Some of these kingdoms like those of Fu-nan and Champā grew very powerful and carried diplomatic relations with China—a fortunate circumstance which has preserved to a large extent their history from oblivion. The fall of Fu-nan, early in the 7th century A.D., marks the close of the first epoch of Hindu Colonization. The second epoch witnessed the rise and fall of mighty Hindu empires in this far off region outside India, which will be described in the next lecture.

## LECTURE III

### HINDU EMPIRES IN SOUTH-EAST ASIA

I have described in the preceding lecture how a large number of Hindu Colonial kingdoms grew up in different parts of South-east Asia during the first five centuries A.D. Some of these, like Fu-nan and Champā, were big and powerful, while others were quite small. Fu-nan, again, extended her power beyond the frontiers of Cambodia and established what may be called the first Hindu Colonial empire in this region. Unfortunately, we possess no details of its growth and extent. But soon other Hindu empires came into existence and played a notable part in extending the political dominion and culture of the Hindus. I propose to discuss some of these in the present lecture.

The oldest of these is Śrī-Vijaya whose capital city, bearing the same name, is usually located in Palembang in South-east Sumatra, though this view has not found general acceptance. As noted in a preceding lecture, it is probable that this kingdom already existed in the fourth century A.D., but we do not know any details of this early period. It is only towards the close of the seventh century A.D. that Śrī-Vijaya comes into prominence. We learn a great deal of this country from the Chinese pilgrim I-tsing who spent a few years in this region and wrote an interesting account of it some time between 689 and 692 A.D. He tells us that the king of Śrī-Vijaya as well as the rulers of the neighbouring States were patrons of Buddhism, and Śrī-Vijaya was a great centre of Buddhist learning. We are further told that Śrī-Vijaya was a centre of trade and possessed ships sailing to India. There was also a regular navigation between Śrī-Vijaya and China.

Of the political status of Śrī-Vijaya, I-tsing does not tell us much beyond saying that "the Malayu country is now the country of Śrī-Vijaya." This cryptic sentence has led to much discussion, but it probably means that Malayu, which was originally an independent state, was then included in the dominions of Śrī-Vijaya. This Malayu corresponds to Jambi in Sumatra, which is a coastal region to the north west of Palembang.

The subjugation of this region by Śrī-Vijaya is proved by an inscription found in the province of Jambi. It begins with an invocation to the gods who protect the kingdom of Śrī-Vijaya. It then threatens to inflict severe punishment upon the inhabitants of countries, subordinate to Śrī-Vijaya, if they revolt, or even aid, abet, or meditate revolt against the suzerain authority. Punishment was to be inflicted not only upon actual rebels but also upon their families and clans.

A copy of this record, which breathes aggressive imperialism from beginning to end, has been also found at Kota Kapur in the island of Banka, separated by

a narrow strait from Palembang. There is, however, a post-script added to this latter record, stating that it was engraved in the Śaka year 608 (=686 A.D.) when the army of Śrī-Vijaya was starting on an expedition against Java which had not yet submitted to its authority.

It would thus appear that by 686 A.D., Śrī-Vijaya was already a powerful kingdom having extended its authority to Jambi, Banka and other regions in the neighbourhood, and had sent a military expedition against the island of Java, separated from it by a narrow strait on the south-east. The king of Śrī-Vijaya at this time was probably Śrī-Jayanāśa<sup>1</sup> who is known from a record dated 684 A.D.

The result of this expedition is not known to us, and for nearly a century we do not know much of the political history of Śrī-Vijaya. But there is no doubt that it continued to be a powerful state throughout this period. This is proved by the several embassies which Śrī-Vijaya sent to China during the period between 670 and 741 A.D. It appears from some details preserved in connection with an embassy that Śrī-Vijaya was recognized as a leading and powerful state by the Chinese emperor.

It is not till 775 A.D. that we again learn something definite about Śrī-Vijaya. A Sanskrit inscription, dated in that year and engraved on a stele found at Ligor in Malay Peninsula, refers to the mighty prowess of a Buddhist king of Śrī-Vijaya whose name is not mentioned. He is said to be the overlord of all neighbouring states whose kings made obeisance to him.

It is clear from this inscription that Śrī-Vijaya, whose imperial career began in the last quarter of the seventh century A.D., had in course of the next century extended her political supremacy over the Malay Peninsula, as far at least as the Bay of Bandon, more than a thousand miles away. But it is not merely the long distance or extent of territory that invests the conquest of Ligor with importance. As already noted above, this region offered a short land-route across the Malay Peninsula from Bay of Bengal to the China Sea and thus served as an important trade-route between India and South-east Asia. Śrī-Vijaya already controlled the two all-sea routes of this trade passing through the Strait of Malacca and the Sunda Strait. The possession of Ligor enabled her to control all the possible routes of the trade between eastern and western countries. This gives us a key to the imperial policy of Śrī-Vijaya which sent a military expedition to Java in 686, and established political supremacy in the Isthmus of Kra by 775 A.D. As hinted by I-tsing, Śrī-Vijaya was a great naval power, and this no doubt dictated the policy of controlling the trade-routes and supplied means to execute it.

By successfully carrying out this bold and aggressive imperial design, Śrī-Vijaya gained immense power and influence. But she laid down a policy which others were sure to imitate. As a matter of fact, it was not long before another

1 The name may be a mistake for Jayanāga. Stutterheim reads it as Jayawaga.



royal dynasty followed in the footsteps of Śrī-Vijaya and established a mighty empire in this region which, barring the short-lived empire of Majapahit, was not equalled till the foundation of the Dutch empire nearly a thousand years later.

This dynasty, known as the Śailendras, played the dominant role in the politics of this region for nearly five hundred years, and as such deserves a careful study. Fortunately, we possess a great deal of information about them from epigraphic records found in India, Java and Malay Peninsula, and also from the accounts of Arab and Chinese writers. There are, however, some doubts and uncertainties in regard to the interpretation of this multifarious evidence, which have given rise to a voluminous discussion, and a vast literature has grown up on this subject during the last twenty-five years. It is not possible here to enter into a full discussion of this question, but a short recapitulation of the main disputed points is necessary for a proper understanding of the subject.

Mention has just been made of the inscription on a stele at Ligor, referring to the prowess of the king of Śrī-Vijaya. Now a short record is engraved on the back of the same stele consisting of only a single verse and a few letters of another. It refers to a king called Viṣṇu who belonged to the Śailendra dynasty and was also known by the appellation of Śrī-Mahārāja. These two inscriptions may be referred to as A and B.

It was tacitly assumed that the two inscriptions A and B on the two sides of the stele really formed parts of one and the same record, and the conclusion was naturally drawn that the Śailendra Mahārāja named Viṣṇu and the king of Śrī-Vijaya were one and the same person. It was consequently held that the Śailendras were the rulers of Śrī-Vijaya and the mighty empire founded by them was really a development of that of Śrī-Vijaya which formed its nucleus. The history of the Śailendras exercising supremacy over Malay Peninsula, Java and most of the islands of the Archipelago, was thus regarded as a continuous narrative from the foundation of their power in Śrī-Vijaya in Sumatra in the seventh century A.D. No problem concerning the origin of the Śailendras or their home-province therefore exercised the minds of the scholars.

This complacent view was first challenged by me in 1937. I pointed out that the inscription B begins with *svasti* and was written by a different hand. It was thus a separate record and not a part of the other. Besides, in the long eulogy of the king of Śrī-Vijaya in Ins. A, he is nowhere referred to as belonging to the Śailendra dynasty, while Śrī-Vijaya is not mentioned in Ins. B. There is, therefore, no valid ground to connect the Śailendra with Śrī-Vijaya. On the other hand, the only legitimate conclusion from the comparison of the two records seems to be, that the authority over Ligor region passed from the king of Śrī-Vijaya to the hands of the Śailendra kings who were different persons. As the Ins. B was short and incomplete, it was presumably engraved later than Ins. A for which the stele was originally prepared.

At the time when this view was first propounded, it was regarded as revolutionary and there were prolonged controversies and discussions over it. But to-day there is a general consensus in favour of the theory.

A recent writer<sup>2</sup> has remarked, after summing up all the different views on the subject, that whereas no one doubted before 1937 that the Śailendras belonged to Śrī-Vijaya in Sumatra, not a single scholar now locates the original home of the dynasty in that island. The choice now lies between Java and Malay Peninsula, the only two regions where we have got the early records of the dynasty. As we shall see later, the great Buddhist monuments of Java like Barabudur and Chaṇḍi Mendut were the creations of the Śailendras, and not only two inscriptions of that dynasty have been found in Java, but a king of this dynasty is called *Yava-bhūmi-pāla*, or king of Java, in an inscription at Nālandā. These have inclined many scholars to locate their original home in Java. Some, however, hold the view that they first conquered Malay Peninsula and then settled in Java. This and further corollaries to it will be discussed later. But having disposed of the supposed connection between the Śailendras and Śrī-Vijaya, I may now proceed to discuss independently the history of the Śailendras.

As already stated, the Inscription B at Ligor proves that some time after A.D., 775, the date of the main Ins. A., the Śailendras had established their authority in Malay Peninsula. About the same time, we find them ruling in Java. This is proved by two inscriptions found in Java itself. One records the building of a Buddhist temple, dedicated to the goddess Tārā, at Kalasan, by the Śailendra king Mahārāja Paṇamkaraṇa in A.D. 778. Another, found at Kelurak, records the installation of an image of Mañjuśrī in A.D. 782 by Kumāraghoṣa, an inhabitant of Gauḍa (Bengal) and preceptor of king Dharaṇindra of the Śailendra dynasty. These two inscriptions, found in Central Java, and the incomplete inscription at Ligor testify to the Śailendra rule in Java and Malay Peninsula in the last quarter of the eighth century A.D. The extension of their political authority to other islands of the Archipelago is proved by a copper-plate found at Nālandā and dated in the year 39 (or 35) of king Devapāla of the Pāla Dynasty of Bengal which would roughly correspond to A.D. 850. It records the grant of five villages by Devapāla at the request of Bālaputradeva, king of Suvarṇadvīpa, for the maintenance of a monastery built by the latter at Nālandā.

This inscription mentions three generations of Śailendra kings. It refers first to the great king of Yava-bhūmi whose name signified "tormentor of brave foes" (*vīra-vairi-mathanānugat-ābhidhāna*). His son was Samarāgravīra, which may be a proper name or an epithet denoting 'foremost warrior in battle'. By his wife Tārā, daughter of king Varmasetu, he had a son Śrī-Bālaputra.

2 Briggs in *JAOS*, Vol. 70, p. 76; Vol. 72, p. 37. The article contains an exhaustive and excellent summary of the different views on the origin of the Śailendra dynasty.

This genealogy raises several historical problems and has provoked much discussion. To deal with all of them in details would be travelling beyond the scope of the present lecture. It is enough to consider only a few essential points.

In the first place while the grandfather is called the ruler of Yava-bhūmi, the grandson is introduced as king of Suvarṇadvīpa. Scholars generally take the first to refer to Java and the second to Sumatra, and are consequently at pains to reconcile the discrepancy involved. Thus Coedès<sup>3</sup> thinks that Śrī-Vijaya was conquered by the Śailendras of Java, and Bālaputra was ruling in Sumatra, on behalf of his father, the king of Java. He fortifies this conclusion by taking Bālaputra, not as a proper name, but as meaning a young son. K. A. N. Sastri,<sup>4</sup> on the other hand, takes Bālaputra as an independent ruler of Sumatra. He rejects the idea that the Śailendras of Java spread their sway over Śrī-Vijaya in Sumatra. He thinks it not unlikely that some of the earlier rulers of Śrī-Vijaya were Śailendras also, but in any case "Śrī-Vijaya and Java were on friendly terms and undertook many enterprises together with a view to aggrandize their power and influence in the rest of the Archipelago and over Indo-China." He thus seems to distinguish two Śailendra dynasties, one ruling in Java, and the other in Śrī-Vijaya in Sumatra. The Ligor Ins. B was, in his opinion, either engraved by Śailendra from Śrī-Vijaya or the work of a Javanese Śailendra king.

These and similar other views rest on the assumption that Suvarṇadvīpa and Yava-bhūmi, mentioned in the Nālandā plate, refer to two distinct localities or kingdoms. I do not think there is any valid reason for this assumption. I have discussed the question at length in my book entitled *Suvarṇadvīpa*, and have tried to show that while this name was applied to different localities like Burma and Sumatra, it was also used as a general designation for the islands of the Malay Archipelago. Thus it is definitely asserted by Alberuni that "the islands of the Zābaj are called by the Hindus Suvarṇadvīpa." Ibn Saīd also says that Zābag is an archipelago consisting of a large number of islands which produce excellent gold, and that Sribuza (*i.e.* Śrī-Vijaya) is the greatest of the islands of Zābag. There is no doubt, therefore, that Zābaj or Zābag, by which the Arabs writers denote the Malay Archipelago, was also called by the Hindus Suvarṇadvīpa.

If we take Suvarṇadvīpa in the Nālandā Inscription in this general sense there is no contradiction involved by calling Bālaputra as lord of Suvarṇadvīpa and his grandfather, a king of Java. It would imply that starting from their base in Java, the Śailendras gradually made themselves masters of the whole of the Malay Archipelago or the greater part of it, and this was accomplished by the middle of the 9th century A.D.

<sup>3</sup> *Etats*, 160, 185-6.

<sup>4</sup> *Srī-Vijaya*, p. 56.

I cannot think of any valid ground why this natural interpretation should not be accepted, and we shall create unnecessary difficulties in the interpretation of the Nālandā charter. As matter of fact, Coedés takes Suvarṇadvīpa to include Sumatra and Malay Peninsula,<sup>5</sup> and there is as much or as little reason to include the other islands of the Archipelago. Śrī K. A. N. Sastri,<sup>6</sup> however, positively affirms that Suvarṇadvīpa can only mean Sumatra, as would be apparent from his statement that "Bālaputra is called king of Sumatra in so many words ( *Suvarṇadvīpādhipa* )." Yet he does not refer in the least to the arguments I adduced in my book in favour of the use of Suvarṇadvīpa as a general designation of Malay Archipelago.

An additional argument in favour of my view is afforded by the Arab writers who from the middle of the ninth century onwards refer to the great empire of the Mahārājā known as Zābaj or Zābag. All scholars agree that this refers to the empire of the Śailendras. When, therefore, an Indian inscription refers to Bālaputradeva of the Śailendra dynasty as lord of Suvarṇadvīpa, about the middle of the ninth century A.D., nothing is more natural than to suppose that the term was used to denote Malay Archipelago or Zābaj of Arab writers, which, according to Alberuni, was called by the Hindus Suvarṇadvīpa.

Having discussed this general question we may now go back to the historical accounts of the Śailendra kings as given in the Nālandā charter. The first Śailendra king mentioned in this charter is referred to as the ruler of Yava-bhūmi or Java. His proper name is not mentioned, but we are told that it meant "tormentor of brave foes." The original Sanskrit expression for this, 'vīra-vairimathana,' immediately recalls the epithet "vairi-vara-vīra-vimardana" applied to the Śailendra king Dharaṇīndra in the Kelurak Inscription, dated 778 A.D., and the two may be regarded as identical. As the date of this inscription is only removed by three years from that of Kalasan Inscription issued by the Śailendra king Mahārāja Paṇamkaraṇa, he and Dharaṇīndra may be regarded as the same person, the former being the indigenous, and the latter the coronation name. We may thus hold that Paṇamkaraṇa Dharaṇīndra of the Śailendra dynasty was king of Java between 778 and 782 A.D. and he was also probably the Śailendra king referred to in Inscription B at Ligor in Malay Peninsula incised shortly after 775 A.D. Whether Paṇamkaraṇa first ousted the king of Śrī-Vijaya from Malay Peninsula and then extended his authority to Java, or the case was just the reverse, cannot be decided, and both views may be regarded as equally probable. But there can be hardly any doubt that henceforth Java became the real seat of authority. This seems to follow from the pointed reference to the first king as the ruler of *Yava-bhūmipāla*, and is more definitely proved by the great Buddhist monuments of the

5 *Etats*, 160.

6 *Śrī-Vijaya*, p. 56.

Śailendra dynasty in Java like Barabudur and Chaṇḍi Mendut to which reference will be made later. It may also be noted that in Javanese inscriptions the name of Paṇamkaraṇa heads the list of a series of kings, entitled Mahārāja, who ruled in Central Java after Sañjaya, whose known date is A.D. 732.

The son of Paṇamkaraṇa Dharaṇīndra is called Samarāgravīra. As already noted, this may be either a personal name or merely an epithet meaning "foremost warrior in battle." The former view seems more probable. He may be identified with king Samarottunga, mentioned in a record, dated 847 A.D., found at Kedu in Central Java. Samarāgravīra married Tārā, daughter of a king whose name, mentioned in the Nālandā charter, has been read both as Varma-setu and Dharma-setu. The former reading seems preferable. Those who adopt the latter reading suggest his identification with the great Buddhist emperor Dharmapāla of Bengal. But there seems to be hardly any reasonable ground either for this assumption or the suggestion that the temple of the goddess Tārā, the construction of which is recorded in the Kalasan Ins. of 778 A.D., was built in her honour.

Bālaputradeva, at whose request king Devapāla of Bengal granted five villages for the upkeep of his monastery at Nālandā, was the son of Samarāgravīra and Tārā. Everything indicates that the Śailendras had increased their power and prestige during the three quarters of a century that intervened between him and his grand father. The title Lord of Suvarṇadvīpa may be taken as an evidence for his rule over the vast domains of Malay Archipelago, and the very fact that he maintained diplomatic relation with the distant ruler of Bengal is an equally clear indication of his enhanced power and prestige. But the most unambiguous and detailed evidence of the power and glory of the Śailendra empire is furnished by a long series of Arab writers. It is not possible to refer to all of them or give full details of their accounts, but it is necessary to quote a few passages in order to convey an adequate idea of the greatness and grandeur of the empire of the Mahārāja of Zābaj or Zābag, a geographical term by which they denoted Malay Peninsula and Malay Archipelago.

Ibn Khordādhbeh ( 844-848 A.D. ) says that the king of Zābag is named Mahārāja. His daily revenue amounts to two hundred *mans* of gold. Sulaymān ( 851 A.D. ) says that Kalah-bar, *i.e.* the country round the Isthmus of Kra in the Malay Peninsula, is a part of the empire of Zābag. Ibn Rosteh ( 903 A.D. ) remarks that " no other king is richer or more powerful than the Mahārāja, *i.e.* king of kings, and none has more revenue." But the most detailed account of Zābag is furnished by Abū Zayd Ḥasan ( 916 A.D. ). He first tells us that Zābag is the name of an island kingdom as well as its capital city. The area of this kingdom is about 900 ( square ) Parsangs. Then he adds that the king of Zābag is also overlord of a large number of islands extending over a length of 1000 Parsangs or more. Among the kingdoms over which he rules are the island called Sribuza ( *i.e.* Śrī-Vijaya ) with an area of about 400 Parsangs and the maritime

country of Kalah. It is to be noted that here Śrī-Vijaya in Sumatra is clearly distinguished from Zābag, and is said to be merely a dependency of the king of the latter. If Zābag denote Java, as many scholars hold, we find here a corroboration of the view taken above, that Bālaputra-deva, with his seat of authority in Java, was the suzerian ruler of Sumatra and other islands.

Maśūdī ( 943 A.D. ) says that the Mahārāja rules over an empire without limit and has innumerable troops. Even the most rapid vessels could not complete in two years a tour round the isles which are under his possession.

Both Maśūdī and Abū Zayd Ḥasan recount a curious story hinted at by Khordādzbeth, the earliest Arab writer referred to above. It is said that the king throws every morning a brick of solid gold into a shallow lake connecting the palace with the sea. When the king dies, these bricks are collected and distributed among his relatives, officials and the poor.

We also learn from the Arab writers that this immense wealth was derived from his absolute control over trade between China and the western countries. He not only commanded the sea routes, but also the land route across the narrow Isthmus of Kra in the Malay Peninsula. This was commanded by the port of Kalah of which he was the master. Abū Zayd Ḥasan remarks that the town of Kalah is the most important commercial centre for trade in aloe, camphor, sandalwood, ivory, tin, ebony, spices and various other articles. There was a regular maritime intercourse between this port and Oman. The cause of all this is explained by Maśūdī. He says that formerly there was a direct voyage between China and ports like Sīrāf and Oman ( in Persia and Arabia ), but now the port of Kalah serves as the meeting place for the mercantile navies of the two countries. In other words, the Mahārāja of Zābag reaped an immense profit from the world trade between western and eastern Asia which could only pass through seas and lands controlled by him. We can now understand why Śrī-Vijaya extended its conquests to Ligor, and the Śailendras followed in its footsteps. This probably also explains why the Cholas of Southern India wanted to subjugate the Śailendras and extend their authority over the islands of Sumatra and Malay Peninsula which would transfer to them that effective control over the trade between the east and the west which was at the root of the wealth and power, first of Śrī-Vijaya and then of the Śailendras.

The Arab writers generally refer to the power of the Mahārāja of Zābag over the numerous islands of the Archipelago. The location of Zābag, which was the seat of the central authority, is not free from difficulty. Some have identified Zābag with Śrī-Vijaya. Others take Zābag as embracing the entire archipelago, and possibly also the Malay Peninsula, but regard Sribuza, *i.e.* Śrī-Vijaya ( Sumatra ), as the most important island of Zābag, and the centre of the empire of the Mahārāja. Both these views completely ignore the fact that the Arabs clearly distinguish the island of Zābag from that of Śrī-Vijaya and regard the

latter as a dependency of the former. Other scholars therefore identify Zābag with Java and, as stated above, this seems to be the most probable view. But this theory involves some difficulties and cannot be reconciled with the different statements of the Arab writers. Some have therefore proposed to place Zābag in the Malay Peninsula. But, this, too, is not free from difficulties. It is not unlikely that Zābag at first denoted Java, but though the seat of central authority was shifted elsewhere in course of time, the old designation still continued. On the whole Zābag cannot be definitely located and the question must be left open, until more positive evidence is forthcoming.

But whether Zābag was identical with Java or not, there is no doubt that Java was an important stronghold of the Śailendras in the second half of the eighth century A.D. It appears from epigraphic evidence in Java that they established their authority there some time after 732 A.D., when the island was being ruled by a king named Sañjaya, and continued to rule probably till at least about the middle of the ninth century A.D.

If we remember this fact we can easily assert that the power of the Śailendras was not confined to the Malay Peninsula and Malay Archipelago but was also felt in the mainland *viz.* Kambuja and Champā. As regards Kambuja, an Arab account, probably written by Sulaymān, preserves a long story describing how the Mahārāja of Zābag invaded the Khmer country and killed its ruler. The story undoubtedly belongs to the domain of folklore, but seems to have been based on a real struggle between Java and Cambodia. For we learn from a Cambodian inscription that Jaya-varman, who came from Java and became king of Kambuja in A.D. 802, performed a religious ceremony to ensure that Kambuja might not again be dependent on Java. This undoubtedly shows that Cambodia acknowledged the suzerainty of Java about the close of the eighth century A.D. As this was precisely the time when the Śailendras are known to have ruled in Java, we may conclude that it was under this royal dynasty that Java felt powerful enough to extend her domination over the mainland.

The Chinese annals refer to an invasion of a region in Tonkin in 767 A.D. by the people of Co-lon ( Kuen-Luen ) and of Daba, which has been identified with Cho-po or Java. Again the inscriptions of Java refer to at least two naval raids by foreigners, one in 774 and the other in 787 A.D. In the latter case the raiders are expressly said to be " the army of Java coming by means of ships. " The third, certainly, and the other two, most probably, refer to naval expeditions sent by the Śailendra Mahārāja of Zābag whose great empire is described by the Arab writers.

It would thus appear that the Śailendras were the dominant power both in sea and land in South-east Asia during the period c. 750-850 A.D. They gave a sort of political unity to Malay Archipelago and Malay Peninsula such as the

region never knew before or since, till the advent of the Dutch about a thousand years later.

There are grounds to believe that the Śailendras were fresh arrivals from India. In the first place their inscriptions are written in the North-Indian script of the period which is different from the script then in use in Java. Secondly, the Arab writers not only refer to them by the purely Indian title Mahārāja, which actually forms the name-ending of rulers of some Indian dynasties, but also testify to their close connection with India. Thus Ibn Rosteh says that the Mahārāja of Zābag is not regarded as the greatest among the kings of India because he dwells in the islands. Mašūdi also observes that Zābag, which separates India from China, is comprised within the former country. These evidences are not of course, conclusive. Much has been written about the origin of the Śailendras, but no definite conclusion is possible at the present state of our knowledge.<sup>7</sup>

We learn from the *New History of the T'ang Dynasty* and other Chinese texts that the capital of Java was shifted to the east some time between 742-55 A.D. and was again brought back to the old city before the end of the ninth century A.D. This seems to show that when the Śailendras conquered Java the old ruling dynasty maintained its existence, probably as a dependency, in the eastern part of the island, but re-occupied the old capital, either by driving away the Śailendras, or as soon as they lost their power in Java through other causes. The Śailendras lost their dominion over Kambuja after A.D. 802, and we do not hear of their raids in Champā in the ninth century A.D.

It appears, therefore, that the decline of the Śailendras began with the ninth century A.D., when they lost their hold over the mainland. Before the century was over, they also lost Java. But inspite of these losses, the Śailendras continued as a great power throughout the tenth century A.D. This is proved by the accounts of the Arab writers who refer to Zābag till the end of that century.

From the beginning of the tenth century, for a period of more than three hundred years, the Chinese annals frequently refer to a kingdom called San-fo-tsi, and give many interesting details about it. Though the origin of the Chinese name is obscure, there is no doubt that it refers to the great island-empire called Zābag by the Arab writers. San-fo-tsi had very intimate diplomatic and trade relations with China. The Chinese accounts fully corroborate the Arab testimony about the political and commercial greatness of the Mahārāja's Empire throughout the tenth century A.D.

Towards the close of the tenth century A.D., a war broke out between Java and San-of-tsi. We learn from the Chinese chronicles that an ambassador from San-of-tsi to China left the imperial capital in A.D. 990, but learnt, on reaching Canton, that his country had been invaded by Java. The war continued till

7 Cf. *Suvarṇadvīpa* I, 225 ff. *JGIS*, I. 61 ff.



A.D. 992 when the ambassador of San-fo-tsi, still unable or unwilling to go back to his own country, requested the Chinese emperor to issue a decree making San-fo-tsi a protectorate of China. This expression must not be taken at its face-value, and probably means nothing more than mediation or diplomatic support. But in any case it may be taken for granted that Java, which had so long been ruled over by the Śailendras, not only freed herself from their yoke, but also took the aggressive and even invaded their country. But although Java had some initial success the Śailendras triumphed in the long run. In 1003 A.D., San-fo-tsi recovered her strength sufficiently to send an embassy to China. Three years later we hear of Java being destroyed by a great catastrophe. The capital city was burnt to ashes, the king died, and his successor had to take to flight. Although the exact nature of the catastrophe is nowhere stated, all the known details seem to indicate a successful foreign invasion. It has been accordingly suggested that now San-fo-tsi in its turn invaded Java, completely defeated her king, and dealt a final blow to the hated rival after a prolonged struggle. If this view were accepted we must hold that after a temporary eclipse the great empire of Zābag or San-fo-tsi again revived its power and authority to a large extent.

That this great maritime empire was being ruled over by the kings of the Śailendra dynasty at the beginning of the eleventh century A.D. is proved by a comparison of Chinese texts with Chola inscriptions. The former refer to two embassies to China sent by two kings of San-fo-tsi, one by king Se-li-chu-la-wu-ni-fu-ma-tiau-hwa in A.D. 1003 and another by king Se-ri-ma-la-p'i in 1008 A.D. These two royal names correspond closely to Śrī Chūlāmaṇi-varman and his son and successor Śrī Māra-vijayottuṅga-varman of the Śailendra dynasty, rulers of Kaḍāra or Kaṭāha (Kedda in Malaya Peninsula)<sup>8</sup> and Śrī-Vishaya (*i.e.* Śrī-Vijaya), whose names occur in a copper-plate Grant of the Chola king Rājendra Chola.

This Grant is a very interesting record and recalls the Nālandā Charter of an earlier date. We learn from it that a Buddhist *Vihāra* was constructed at Nāgapaṭṭana (Negapatam in Madras) by the Śailendra king Chūlāmaṇi-varman, and completed by his son Māra-vijayottuṅga-varman. The Chola king Rājārāja the Great granted, in A.D. 1005, the revenues of a village for the upkeep of the shrine of Buddha in this *Vihāra*, though the edict was actually issued after his death by his son and successor Rājendra Chola. We also know from old Tamil literature that there were trade relations between the two countries, facing each other right across the Bay of Bengal.

When this friendly relation between the two countries began, it is difficult to say. But it did not last long after accession of the ambitious ruler Rājendra Chola.

---

<sup>8</sup> This is the general view, but Mr. Wilkinson opposes it (*J. Mal. Br. R. A. S.* XV Part III, p. 120).

Two inscriptions of Rājendra Chola, dated respectively in 1017-18 and 1022-23 A.D., refer to his conquest of Kaṭāha or Kaḍāram ( Keddah ) beyond the sea, and several inscriptions of later periods, beginning from A.D. 1024-5, give a detailed account of his over-sea conquests giving a long list of countries over-run by him. It is, therefore, probable that hostilities broke out in or before A.D. 1018<sup>9</sup> and culminated in the final overthrow of the Śailendras in A.D. 1025 or earlier.

We learn from the detailed account that Rājendra Chola sent a big naval expedition and defeated ( *lit.* caught ) Saṅgrāma-vijayottuṅga-varman, the king of Kaḍāram. Then follow the names of thirteen countries beginning with Śrī-Vijaya and ending with Kaḍāram. Evidently these were successively over-run by the Chola forces. All the localities cannot be identified with certainty, but one of these probably refers to Nicobar islands, and of the rest, some were in Sumatra and others in Malay Peninsula. The detailed list of countries, many of which are included in the empire of San-fo-tsi by later Chinese writers, leaves no doubt that the Chola conquest cannot be taken merely as a conventional or vague boast, but was actually an historical fact.

This great oversea victory is a unique event in the annals of Indian history, and speaks volumes about the naval supremacy of the Cholas. It proves the existence of powerful naval forces in ancient India, and though positive evidence is lacking regarding the possession of navy by any other state, since the Mauryas, it is difficult to believe that the revival began and ended with the Cholas.

We do not know any specific cause for the hostility between the Cholas and the Śailendras, and probably the ambition of controlling the East-West trade was really at the bottom of it. The monopoly of the Śailendras over this trade was threatened by the growing naval power of the Cholas, and the latter also probably encouraged by the decline in the power of the Śailendras to make a bold bid to take their place. In such circumstances, pretexts would not be wanting for the opening of hostilities by one side or the other.

9 Prof. K. A. N. Sastri observes: " The data on which Majumdar relies for the supposed first expedition are neither reliable nor conclusive ( See *Colas* 1, p. 254 and f.n. )". ( *History of Śrī-Vijaya*, p. 79, f.n. 13 ). As noted above, the conquest of Kaṭāha is mentioned in the Tiruvalangadu plates, dated 1017-8 A.D. I do not know what can be more reliable or conclusive evidence than the explicit statement contained in an inscription. Nor do I find anything against it on p. 254 of the *Colas*, Vol. I referred to by Prof. Sastri. I have already discussed ( *Suvarnavīpa*, I, p. 171, f.n. 2 ) the objection that was raised by the Editor of the inscription, but Prof. Sastri has not referred to it. His only argument seems to be that as ' Rajendra Chola was on friendly terms with the Śailendra king for some time after the death of Rājarāja in 1014 A.D., 1017 appears altogether too early a date for a Chola expedition against Sri-Vijaya ' ( *Ibid* ). But the change from friendship to hostility between two great powers in course of two or three years is not so improbable a contingency that we shall reject on this account the positive statement of a contemporary record.

Another equally interesting problem is the net result of the Chola conquest of the Śailendra empire. The king Saṅgrāma-vijayottuṅga-varman is said to have been caught, which presumably means captured. If we take it to be literally true, we do not know whether he was restored. The fact that the Chinese Chronicles refer to an embassy from the king of San-fo-tsi, named Si-li-tieh-hwa (Śrī Deva) in A.D. 1028, shows that Saṅgrāma-vijayottuṅga-varman was either not released, or even if restored, did not long survive his defeat.

This embassy also proves the continued existence of San-fo-tsi as a separate political unit.<sup>10</sup> It probably acknowledged suzerainty of the Cholas, but how far or how long it was really effective and not merely nominal, it is difficult to say. Two inscriptions of the Chola king Virarājendra inform us that some time before A.D. 1069-70 he conquered Kaḍāram on behalf of a king who had come in search of his aid and protection, and afterwards handed over the conquered kingdom to his protégé who acknowledged him as suzerain. Curiously enough a Chinese Chronicle represents Chola as a vassal state of San-fo-tsi during the period 1068-77. Either this was a deliberate misrepresentation to the Chinese court made by San-fo-tsi, or there might be a basis for it in some temporary success gained by the latter over the Cholas in course of the war with Virarājendra or Kulottuṅga (1070-1118 A.D.). For the latter also claims to have destroyed Kaḍāram. It would thus appear that for nearly half a century after the conquest of Rājendra Chola his successors tried to keep their hold on the distant oversea conquests, though with varying degrees of success.

But friendly relation seems to have been restored before A.D. 1090. We learn from a Tamil inscription dated in that year that the king of Kiḍāram (*i.e.* Kaḍāram) sent two envoys named Rājavidyādhara and Abhimānottuṅga to the court of Kulottuṅga. At the request of these envoys the Chola king not only renewed the endowment made in the reign of Rājarāja I but also made additions to it which more than doubled the value of the original income. After this friendly gesture we hear no more of the struggle between the Cholas on the one hand and San-fo-tsi or Kaḍāra or Śrī-Vijaya on the other.

The kingdom of San-fo-tsi continued for more than three hundred years till it was destroyed by Java in the fourteenth century A.D. We get a reference to it in the Chinese Chronicles, and Arab writers refer to the glory and power of Zābag throughout this period. We have a detailed account of San-fo-tsi from a Chinese text written by Chau-ju-kua, Inspector of Foreign Trade, in 1225 A.D. We learn from it that San-fo-tsi was master of the Strait of Malacca and thus controlled the maritime trade between China and the western countries. The author also gives a list of fifteen states dependent upon it.

10 I have elsewhere suggested that Śrī-Deva might refer to Rājendra Chola (*Suvarṇadvīpa*, I. 185). In that case San-fo-tsi was still a dependency of the Cholas.

There is no reason to disregard the views of Arab and Chinese writers that the old empire of Zābag or San-fo-tsi continued in its old glory and splendour till about the middle of the thirteenth century A.D. But we do not know whether the Śailendras still ruled over it. As a matter of fact the name Śailendra passes out of history with Śrī Saṅgrāma-vijayottuṅga-varman, who was defeated and captured by Rājendra Chola's forces about A.D. 1025. What became of him or his successors we do not know. The dynasty might have continued to rule or his successors we do not know. The dynasty might have continued to rule over the empire, even down to its last days, but we have no definite evidence of this.<sup>11</sup>

The Ceylonese chronicles have preserved an interesting account of two invasions of Ceylon by a king of Jāvaka, called Chandrabhānu, about A.D. 1236 and 1256. In an inscription, dated 1264 A.D., Jaṭavarman Vira-Pāṇḍya, king of the Pāṇḍya kingdom in South India, claims to have defeated and killed the Śāvaka king, and in another inscription, dated the next year, the king of Kaḍāram is said to have been defeated by him. The Śāvaka is no doubt the same as Jāvaka or Zābag, and its ruler is probably the same as that of Kaḍāram and to be identified with Chandrabhānu. Chandrabhānu, who was powerful enough to have led two expeditions to Ceylon, thus met with a tragic end, for which his ill-conceived expeditions to Ceylon were perhaps mainly responsible.

An inscription of Chandrabhānu has been found at Chaiya near Ligor. As it is dated A.D. 1230, the king has been identified with the Jāvaka king of that name. He is said to have been born in the family of lotus and called Lord of Tāmbraliṅga. This seems to indicate that the headquarters of Jāvaka or Zābag were located in Malaya Peninsula, and its rulers did not belong to the Śailendra family in the thirteenth century.

As Tāmbraliṅga is included among the dependencies of San-fo-tsi by Chau-ju-kua, Chandrabhānu seems to have usurped the authority of his overlord by a successful rebellion. But, if so, Chandrabhānu was probably the last great ruler of Zābag. The example set by him of rebellion against the overlord was followed by other States. Being hard pressed by the rising power of Java on

11 An ingenious suggestion has been made that a lady named Saṅgrāma-vijaya-Dharma-prasādotuṅgadevī, who, from A.D. 1030 to 1041, held a very high position in the court of Airlaṅga, king of Java, was his queen, and either a daughter or widow of the Sailendra king Saṅgrāma-vijayottuṅga-varman mentioned above. This marriage is said to have cemented the alliance between the two old rival powers, which henceforth continued friendly relations with each other (Coedès, *Etats*. 247).

In spite of the similarity of names we cannot definitely associate the lady in the court of Java with the Śailendra king. Even if the identity be accepted, it does not prove the continuance of the Śailendras as a ruling power. For if the lady in question were the daughter of the Śailendra king, she might have been married before the Chola invasion. If she were the widow, it might be rather an evidence of the end of Śailendra rule, forcing his widow to take refuge in a neighbouring country, and afterwards marry its king.

the one hand and the Thais of Siam on the other, Jāvaka or San-fo-tsi lost her position of supremacy and gradually sank into a local power. She continued this inglorious existence for nearly a century when it was finally conquered by Java, which then stepped into the imperial position so long held by Zābag.

The Śailendra Empire was the central pivot of the history of Malaya Archipelago for nearly five centuries. Some idea of its wealth and splendour may still be formed from the monuments like Barabudur, Chaṇḍi Kalasan, Chaṇḍi Mendut, and numerous other temples in Central Java, to which reference will be made later. We may now pass on to the history of Java, which succeeded Zābag or San-fo-tsi of the Śailendras as the leading power.

Reference has been made above to the early Hindu kingdom in West Java under king Pūrṇa-varman. We next hear of a king Sannāha and his son Sañjaya ruling in the first half of the eighth century AD in Central Java, in a region which was later known as the kingdom of Matarām. Not long after the death of Sañjaya, Central Java was, as we have seen above, conquered by the Śailendras. The old rulers of Central Java shifted to the east and remained there for more than a century, but they again occupied Central Java before the close of the ninth century A.D. Eastern Java, however, never lost the importance it had gained during this interval, and from about 929 A.D., when Siṇḍok ascended the throne, the political centre of gravity was definitely and permanently shifted towards the east. Central Java, which was decorated by the wonderful monuments like Barabudur and became a renowned seat of culture under the Śailendras, gradually receded into the background, and ultimately lost all political importance as well as cultural eminence. Various reasons have been put forward to explain this, such as a volcanic eruption, out-break of an epidemic or the ravages by the fleet of the Śailendras. The last-named theory finds a support in the renewed struggle between Java and the Śailendras and the great catastrophe that overwhelmed Java about A.D. 1006. Since then Central Java, with all its splendid monuments, became desolate and deserted, and the new kingdom of Eastern Java under Airlaṅga came into prominence.

Airlaṅga was the son-in-law of the Javanese king who died shortly after the great catastrophe of A.D. 1006. There was a complete political disintegration of Java, and Airlaṅga, then aged sixteen, fled and took refuge in a hermitage at Vanagiri. In A.D. 1010 the principal chiefs and Brāhmaṇas of Java approached him with a request to ascend the throne of his father-in-law, and in A.D. 1019 he was formally consecrated to the throne with the title of Śrī Lokeśvara Dharmavarṃśa Airlaṅga Anantavikramottuṅgadeva. By a series of fights, he brought the whole of the island under his control and once more restored its prosperity. His records contain a long list of foreigners who used to come to Java for purposes of trade or other peaceful pursuits of life. The list includes Kliṅg or Kaliṅga, Siṃhala, Draviḍa, Karṇāṭaka, Champā and Kmir, *i.e.* Khmers of Kambuja.

Thus Java became once again an international seat of trade and Hindu culture. Airlaṅga abdicated the throne in his old age and took to the life of an ascetic. He was regarded as an incarnation of Viṣṇu, and a fine figure of Viṣṇu, seated on Garuḍa, found at Belahan, is believed to be the actual representation of the king.

Before his retirement Airlaṅga divided the kingdom between his two sons. Of the two states that arose in this way Kaḍiri became famous. The capital city Keḍiri still exists under the old name. Its kings were great patrons of literature and to them belongs the credit for the rich Indo-Javanese literature to which reference will be made later.

In 1222 A.D. Kaḍiri was conquered by the neighbouring king of Singhasāri named Rājasa who united the whole of Eastern Java under his authority. Kṛtanagara, who succeeded to the throne of Singhasāri in 1268 A.D.,<sup>12</sup> was a remarkable king. According to *Nāgara-Kṛtāgama*, a famous historical poem of Java, he was well-versed in the six-fold royal policy, expert in all branches of knowledge and quite at home in Buddhist scriptures. He revived the imperial policy of the Śailendras and extended the political authority of Java over Bali, Suṇḍa, Sumatra, Malay Peninsula, Borneo and Madura. About this time Kublai Khan, the great Mongol ruler of China, invited the king of Java to come in person to the imperial court and pay homage to the Emperor. After evading the invitation for some time, Kṛtanagara became angry and mutilated the Chinese ambassador in A.D. 1289. This provoked the wrath of the great Mongol and he sent a powerful expedition to Java.

In the meantime the governor of Kaḍiri revolted, killed Kṛtanagara and occupied Singhasāri. The supremacy of Kaḍiri, thus restored after seventy years, was, however, of short duration. The Chinese expedition sent by Kublai Khan overran the country and Vijaya, Son-in-law of Kṛtanagara, cleverly turned this formidable force against the ruler of Kaḍiri, who was defeated and killed in A.D. 1293. After the Chinese forces had left Java, Vijaya founded a new kingdom with his capital at Majapahit or Tikta-vilva ( Bitter Vilva fruit ), and assumed the name Kṛtarājasa Jayavardhana. Although the capital was changed, the new kingdom was practically a continuation of the kingdom of Singhasāri and pursued the aggressive imperial policy of Kṛtanagara with great success. During the reign of Rājasanagara, who ascended the throne in A.D. 1350, Java established its suzerainty over almost all the principal islands and a large portion of the Malay Peninsula including the old kingdom of San-fo-tsi. The mighty fleet of Rājasanagara enabled him to maintain his effective hold upon the subordinate states, a list of which is given in the historical poem *Nāgara-Kṛtāgama*, which was composed in A.D. 1365 during his reign. Thus once more, after the Śailendra empire,

12 He had already been anointed king by his father in 1254 A.D.

there was a hegemony of Malay Peninsula and Malay Archipelago. Roughly speaking, the Majapahit empire comprised the recent Dutch possessions in the East Indies with the addition of a large part of Malay Peninsula, but excluding Northern Celebes. We learn from *Nāgara-Kṛtāgama* that Majapahit had intimate and friendly intercourse with Siam, Kambuja, Champā, North Annam, Dharmanagarī, Martaban and other neighbouring countries. It had also trade relation with these and other countries like Jambudvīpa, China, Karṇāṭaka and Gauḍa. Jambudvīpa, of course, refers to India, while Karṇāṭaka and Gauḍa are specially mentioned perhaps to indicate more intimate intercourse with them. Jambudvīpa and Java are lauded in a verse as the good lands *par excellence*, and poems praising the Javanese king were composed by a monk from Kāñchī and a Brāhmaṇa.

The death of Rājasanagara in 1389 A.D. was followed by internal dissensions for nearly a quarter of a century ending in a disastrous civil war. This led to the decline of Java as an Imperial power and we find a number of its subordinate states, including San-fo-tsi, transferring their allegiance to China at the beginning of the fifteenth century A.D.

The Hindu kingdom of Majapahit continued for another century. In 1504 the great Sultan of Malacca was afraid of an invasion by Java which testifies to the latter's power and command over the sea. But during the fifteenth century Islamic creed gradually got a footing in Java by peaceful conversion. First we find a small community of Muslim traders early in the fifteenth century. Then a number of ruling chiefs and high officials adopted the new faith. Even the royal family contained some converts to Islam. Thus grew up a small but influential community of Muslims in Java, who tried to oust the Hindu king as he steadily refused to give up his ancestral religion. The Hindu king fought bravely against his own kith and kin. Even after the loss of Majapahit he held out for some time in the eastern part of Java, and only a second defeat forced him to leave Java and seek shelter in the neighbouring island of Bali, which was a subordinate State. The royal family, the aristocracy, and a considerable element of the well-to-do classes who still adhered to the Hindu faith followed the king to Bali. The old Hindu culture of Java flourishes there even to-day. The island of Bali thus possesses the unique distinction of preserving the rich heritage of Hindu civilization, while in Java itself the old monuments alone remain to tell the tale of its past glory and grandeur.

We may now pass on to the mainland of Indo-China.

While the mighty Śailendra Empire was ruling over the sea, a powerful Hindu kingdom was founded in Kambuja. We have traced the rise and fall of Fu-nan and referred to the growing power of Bhava-varman about the middle of the sixth century A.D. Under him and his two successors, Mahendra-varman and Išāna-varman, Kambuja became very powerful. Fu-nan was finally destroyed

and the Kambuja kingdom comprised, at the beginning of the seventh century A.D., the whole of Cambodia and Cochin-China and also the valley of the Mun river to the north of the Dangrek mountains. This kingdom was ruled by the dynasty of Bhava-varman till about 674 A.D. From that period till the accession of Jaya-varman in 802 A.D. we do not know much of this kingdom. As noted above, it was probably subjugated by the Śailendras of Java. Jaya-varman II freed his native land from the yoke of Java and invited a Brāhmaṇa named Hiraṇyadāma to perform some Tantric rites in order that Kambuja might not again be a dependency of Java. For reasons not known to us, he frequently changed his capital and finally fixed it in the Angkor region which remained the political and cultural centre of Java for more than five hundred years. Jaya-varman ascended the throne in A.D. 802 and ruled till 850 A.D., during which period he laid the foundation of the future greatness of Kambuja.

Though we do not know the details of his reign, the fact that for four centuries the epigraphic records of kings of different dynasties refer to Jaya-varman as a great and powerful monarch shows the deep impression that his reign and personality made upon posterity.

The reigns of Jaya-varman II and his son and successor cover the period 802 to 877 A.D. According to a Chinese chronicle, written in A.D. 863, the kingdom of Kambuja included the whole of Central Indo-China and touched the frontiers of Yunnan in Southern China. The Arab writers also describe the Khmer kingdom as vast and powerful, the king of which received homage of other kings. Kambuja had thus begun that career of imperialism which made it the dominant power in Indo-China for centuries to come.

The aggressive imperial policy was continued by the next king Indra-varman who founded a new dynasty. He claims in his record that his commands were respectfully obeyed by the rulers of China, Champā and Yavadvīpa. His son Yaśo-varman, who ascended the throne in 889 A.D., was one of the greatest kings of Kambuja. He distinguished himself by his military campaigns, both by land and sea, and not only maintained intact the vast empire he had inherited, but also enhanced its glory and splendour. He built many temples and a new capital city called after him Yaśodharapura. It included a large part, and formed the nucleus, of the later city of Angkor Thom, which still stands as the eternal symbol of the glory and grandeur of Hindu culture and civilization in South-east Asia.

There is some uncertainty about the date of Yaśo-varman's death. It was generally believed to have taken place at 908 A.D. But a French scholar has shown good grounds for placing it about A.D. 900. If this view be accepted, we must be struck with wonder that Yaśo-varman accomplished so much during a short reign of eleven years. Yaśo-varman strikes us as one of the greatest personalities, and must be regarded as a great king in every sense of the term.



Perhaps the court-poet did not exaggerate very much when he said that the glory of Yaśo-varman was sung, even after his death, by the people "in their games, on their beds, and in their travels."

Another great king of this dynasty was Rājendra-varman, who ruled from A.D. 944 to 968. He carried on victorious campaigns in all directions and successfully invaded Champā. As we have seen above, other kings who preceded him also claimed victories even over China, Champā and Java. That all this was no mere empty boast is proved by Chinese annals and the chronicles of Burma and Siam. We learn from these that both Tonkin and the Hinduized Thai principality of Nan-chao or Mithilā-rāṣṭra in North Yunnan had thrown off the yoke of China which was thus cut off from direct contact with Indo-China.

The position of supremacy lost by China now passed to Kambuja, Mithilā-rāṣṭra now formed a part of the Kambuja Empire, and probably this forms the justification of Indra-varman's claim that his commands were obeyed by China. To the south of Mithilā there were a large number of Hindu kingdoms along the upper valleys of the Mekong such as Ālavi-rāṣṭra, Hari-bhuñjaya, Suvarṇa-grāma etc. which all acknowledged the suzerainty of Kambuja. The central part of Siam or Thailand, viz. the region extending from Kampheng Phet on the north to the Gulf of Siam on the south, known as Lavapurī, formed an integral part of Kambuja. But Kambuja also exercised suzerainty over the petty Hinduized kingdoms lying along the Menam valley in the north, such as Sukhodaya, Yonaka-rāṣṭra and Kshmera-rāṣṭra which touched the Kambuja kingdom of Ālavi-rāṣṭra mentioned before. It is thus quite clear that Kambuja extended her suzerainty over the vast region in Central Indo-China lying to the east of Burma, south of China and west of Annam. This led to the spread of Hindu culture over the little known and inaccessible lands of which many memorials are now coming to light.

In the south the northern part of Malay Peninsula up to the Isthmus of Kra was included in the Kambuja Empire which thus touched the frontier of the Śailendra Empire. In the east Kambuja led many successful expeditions against Champā which ultimately led to its conquest at a later date. Thus Kambuja grew to be the dominant power in Indo-China in course of the ninth and tenth centuries A.D. as the Śailendras were in the Malay Archipelago. Both became the main agents for the propagation of Hindu culture in South-east Asia as is proved by inscriptions and monuments.

The death of Jaya-varman V, the son and successor of Rājendra-varman, in 1001 A.D., ushered in a period full of internal troubles. But king Sūrya-varman I, whose reign covers the first half of the eleventh century, restored the unity of the empire. To prevent the repetition of civil war in future he instituted a novel system which we know from ten inscriptions, all dated in 1011 A.D. These inscriptions contain the identical text of an oath offering unswerving and lifelong

homage and allegiance to the king and dedicating the life to his service, as well as the names of district officers, numbering more than four thousand, who took it in the presence of the sacred fire, the Brāhmaṇas and the *ācāryas*. Among other things the officers swore that they shall not honour any other king, shall never be hostile to their own king, and shall not be the accomplices of any enemy.

Sūrya-varman not only defeated the rival claimants to the throne and put down internal rebellions, but also conquered the whole of Siam and even carried his victorious arms to the Mon kingdom of Thaton in Lower Burma.

In spite of all his precautions, the death of Sūrya-varman was followed by a series of revolts ending in a civil war and partition of the kingdom. But Sūrya-varman II, who ascended the throne in 1113 A.D., once more reunited the kingdom. The inscriptions of Kambuja refer in rapturous terms to the victories of Sūrya-varman and his triumphs over hostile kings, but do not give any details. We know from other sources that he invaded Annam both by land and sea, but could not achieve any success. He also invaded Champā, but in spite of some initial success, his troops met with serious disasters. Still he maintained the empire intact. We learn from Chinese annals that his dominions extended from Champā to Lower Burma and included the northern part of Malay Peninsula up to the Bay of Bandon. He is said to have maintained 200,000 war elephants.

Sūrya-varman was consecrated by Divākara Paṇḍita who initiated him into the mysteries of Vrah Guhya, the Great Secret, probably a Tāntric cult. The king performed Koṭihoma, Lakṣaoma, and the Mahāhoma as well as various sacrifices to the ancestors. But his greatest achievement was the construction of the famous temple known as Angkor Vat, which is justly regarded as one of the wonders of the world.

The death of Sūrya-varman II, some time after 1145 A.D., was again followed by a period of troubles in course of which the king of Champā invaded Kambuja and plundered the capital city in A.D. 1177. Although the king of Kambuja was killed, the country was saved by Jaya-varman VII who defeated the Chams in a naval engagement and made himself master of Kambuja in A.D. 1181.

Jaya-varman VII has deservedly won the epithet of Grand Monarch. He fully avenged the sack of the capital city of Kambuja by Champā. A prolonged war followed, in course of which each side invaded the dominions of the other. But Jaya-varman VII obtained a complete victory in A.D. 1190. The king of Champā was brought a prisoner to Kambuja and the whole kingdom lay prostrate before the victor. He divided it into two parts, and appointed his own brother-in-law and his victorious general rulers over them. But the Chams would not take this defeat lying down and there were constant revolts. At last Kambuja evacuated Champā in 1220 A.D. and a formal peace was concluded two years later.

By the conquest of Champā Jaya-varman's Empire reached the China Sea on the east. On the west he conquered Pagan which at this time comprised both central and south Burma. According to the Chinese chronicles, Pagan was annexed to Kambuja towards the close of the twelfth century A.D. There is no doubt that the conquest was achieved by Jaya-varman VII, but whether by Pagan the Chinese meant the whole of this kingdom or merely a part of it cannot be definitely ascertained.

There is no doubt, in any case, that the empire of Kambuja reached its greatest extent under Jaya-varman VII. It included nearly the whole of Indo-China, from the Sea of China to the Bay of Bengal.

Jaya-varman VII founded the city of Angkor Thom. The Chinese description of it in its palmy days of glory and the extant remains leave no doubt that it must be regarded as one of the greatest cities in ancient and medieval ages, not excluding even Rome and Baghdad.

The town was surrounded by a high wall made of limonite with a ditch beyond it, 110 yds. wide. The ditch has a total length of more than 8 miles and its sides are paved with enormous blocks of stone. The enclosing walls were pierced by huge gates which gave access to the city by means of five grand avenues each 33 yds. wide and running straight from one end to the other. Each gateway consisted of a huge arched opening more than 30 ft. high and 15 ft. wide, and surmounted by four huge heads placed back to back. The town was square in shape, each side measuring about two miles. The grand avenues converge to the Temple of Bayon which occupies almost the central position of the city and is justly regarded as the masterpiece of Kambuja architecture. To the north of the Bayon is a great public square, a sort of forum, about 765 yds. long and 165 yds. wide, surrounded by famous structures such as the Baphuon, the Phimeanakas, the Terrace of Honour etc.

The Kambuja Empire, like the wave in the sea, rose to the highest point only to break down. Its glory did not long survive the death of Jaya-varman VIII, who abdicated the throne in 1295-6 A.D. It was followed, as usual, by internal troubles, but unlike the previous occasions no hero arose to restore its fortunes. This is due to the rise of the Thais who conquered Siam and devastated Angkor region towards the close of the 13th century A.D. Though Kambuja was still a powerful kingdom, its days of greatness were numbered. The conquest of Champā by the Annamites in the fifteenth century A.D. brought these ferocious invaders to the very door of Kambuja.

These two powerful Thai tribes in their fresh vigour pressed Kambuja very hard both from the east and the west. For centuries Kambuja remained the helpless victim of her two pitiless aggressive neighbours. Then it fell a prey to the colonial imperialism of France about the middle of the 19th century A.D.,

and the remnant of the mighty Hindu empire of Kambuja became a French Protectorate. The king of Kambuja still follows the old ceremony by which Yaśovarman, Rājendra-varman, Sūrya-varman and Jaya-varman were consecrated to the throne, and receives the sword of Indra from the Brāhmaṇa descendants of the old priests, but he is nothing more than a mere shadow or a puppet in the hands of a foreign power.

The Kambuja Empire was the only powerful Hindu empire that flourished in Indo-China. The Hindu kingdom of Champā lying to its east never extended its power beyond its border, and its history therefore possesses only a local interest. It never grew to be a very powerful state, though it not unoften hurled defiance even at the imperial powers of China and Kambuja. We have referred above to the sack of its capital city by China and prolonged occupation of the whole kingdom by Kambuja. On the other hand, it defied successfully the mighty power of Kublai Khan, the dreaded Mongol emperor of China, by a heroic resistance for a period of three years. But the most inveterate enemies of Champā were their northern neighbours, the Annamites, who had thrown off the Chinese yoke and founded an independent kingdom in the tenth century A.D. Hostilities broke out towards the end of the century and continued at irregular intervals. Kings of Champā, always ready to provoke but seldom able to resist the Annamite invasions, suffered terrible losses. Before the close of the eleventh century A.D., two districts in the north passed into the hands of the enemy. Early in the 14th century, king Jaya-Siṃhavarman was foolish enough to cede two districts merely for the sake of marrying a princess of Annam. Though weakened by the cessions and internal rebellions, Champā fought bravely and even occasionally scored some success, but ultimately fell a victim to repeated incursions of Annam during the fifteenth century A.D.

The Annamites annexed the northern province of Amarāvātī in A.D. 1402 and the Central province of Vijaya in A.D. 1471. About the middle of the sixteenth century they annexed the Cham territory up to the river of Phanrang. The kingdom of Champā was now reduced to a small principality, with its capital at Bal Chanar in Phanri. An account of its petty chief has been left by the officers of S.S. Galathee who met him there in A.D. 1720. In course of the eighteenth century the Annamites took even Phanrang. In 1822, the last of the long line of Hindu kings, unable to bear the oppressions of the Annamites, passed over to Kambuja with a colony of exiles, leaving princess Po Bia to guard over the so-called Royal treasures of Cham at Bal Chanar. With her death passed away the last emblem of Hindu colony in Champā.

To the west of Kambuja lay the kingdom of Siam, now called Thailand. Reference has been made above to the Hindu kingdom of Dvāravātī in the seventh century A.D., the establishment of Kambuja supremacy, and the subsequent conquest of the country by the Thais. The old culture continued in its

main features and even to-day Siam is a flourishing land of Buddhism. But the political history of the Thais falls beyond the scope of this lecture.

To the north of Siam lies the extensive territory now known as Burma. The early colonization of the Hindus in this region has been referred to above. In the ninth or tenth century A.D. there were three powerful States in Burma. Rāmaññaḍeśa, the country of the Raman or the Mon as they are called to-day, comprising the whole of Lower Burma, Tavoy, Mergui and Tennasserim, was the most powerful of these and was something like a federation of states such as Rāmavati, Haṁsāvati, Śrīkṣetra, Dvāravati etc. It was a strong centre of Hindu civilization and contained a large number of famous Hindu colonies. To the north of this state lay Pagan or Arimardanapura in Upper Burma, along the valleys of the Irawaddy and the Chindwin. Still further to the north and north-east, along the valleys of the Upper Irawaddy and the Salween lay a number of Thai states which were often federated together and designated as Kauśāmbī.

All these states were ultimately absorbed by Pagan. According to Burmese chronicles the city of Pagan was founded in 849 A.D. and got the classical name Arimardanapura. The greatness of the kingdom, of which it formed the capital city, begins with the accession of Anawratha, the Burmese form of the Sanskrit name Aniruddha, in A.D. 1044.

About this time a debased form of Tāntrism prevailed in the country, but Aniruddha was converted to the pure Theravāda form of Buddhism by a Brāhmaṇa monk of Thaton, named Arahan and also known as Dharmadarśī. More monks came from the Mon country in the south, and Theravāda form of Buddhism triumphed over the old Tāntric cult. Necessity was now felt of securing sacred books and king Aniruddha sent envoys to the Mon king asking for complete copies of Buddhist Tripiṭaka. The latter not only refused the request but also insulted the envoys of Pagan. Aniruddha thereupon invaded the Mon country and Thaton capitulated. Aniruddha not only brought its king as captive but also carried away with him a large number of monks, artisans and craftsmen as well as Buddhist scriptures and sacred relics laden on thirtyfour elephants.

Aniruddha next conquered Arakan and is said to have visited Bengal. According to the Burmese chronicles his kingdom extended up to Paṭṭikera, a principality in the district of Tipperah in Bengal. To the east he led his victorious army against the Thais of Yunnan, and the chiefs of various Shan states acknowledged his suzerainty. By dint of these and other victories Aniruddha brought under his sway nearly the whole of modern Burma with the exception of Tenasserim.

But this political unification of Burma was not the only great achievement of Aniruddha. Far more important was the complete transformation of Burmese culture under the influence of the Mons. The Burmese, a rude unlettered people,

representing a comparatively late Mongolian wave of immigration, had mostly destroyed the ancient culture. Under the inspiration and personal example of Aniruddha they now adopted the religion, script and sacred literature of India, as represented by the Mon culture, which thus commenced a new career in Pagan. The world has scarcely seen such an example of the conquerors being completely captivated by the conquered. The Hīnayāna form of Buddhism, hitherto current in Lower Burma, now became the dominant religion in the whole country, a position which it happily retains down to the present time.

Although deeply influenced by the Mons, Burma henceforth maintained close relations both with East India and Ceylon. With the proverbial zeal of a new convert, Aniruddha built numerous temples and monasteries, and came to be recognised as the defender of Buddhist faith. When Ceylon was ravaged by the Cholas, its king requested Aniruddha to send Buddhist monks and scriptures. Aniruddha granted the request and got in return a duplicate of the tooth relic of Buddha. But sometimes he went to the extreme. For example, in the well-known Buddhist formula, *ye dharmā hetuprabhavā etc.*, he substituted his own name for that of the Buddha.

Aniruddha married a princess of Vaiśālī in India and their son Kyanzittha was crowned in 1084 A.D. under the title Tribhuvanādityadharma-*rāja*. He desired to marry his daughter to the prince of Paṭṭikera in Bengal, and this love episode, ending in a tragedy, forms the theme of Many Burmese poems and dramas which are acted on the stage even now.

During the reign of Kyanzittha many Buddhists and Vaiṣṇavas went from India and settled in his kingdom. It is said that the king fed eight Indian monks with his own hands for three months and, on hearing from them the description of Indian temples, built on that model the famous temple of Ānanda at Pagan. Whatever we may think of this story there is no doubt that this masterpiece of Burman architecture closely followed the Indian model, as will be shown later. Kyanzittha also completed the Shwezigon Pagoda begun by his father, and built about forty smaller pagodas. He repaired the famous temple of Bodh-Gayā and is said to have married a Chola princess.

The successor of Kyanzittha also maintained intimate relation with India. The king of North Arakan who, being driven out, was restored to the throne by the Burmese king, wanted to show his gratitude, and was asked by the latter to repair the Bodh-Gayā temple, which he gladly did. He is also said to have visited Malaya and Bengal and married a daughter of the king of Paṭṭikera in Bengal.

The city of Arimardanapura or Pagan grew in splendour, and the empire founded by Aniruddha continued in glory for nearly two centuries. But the great Mongol chief Kublai Khan wrought its ruin. In A.D. 1271, he sent envoys to Burma asking the king to accept his suzerainty. As this was refused, hostilities

began. The Burmese took the aggressive and were defeated. A revolt followed in Burma and Kublai took advantage of it to invade the country. The Mongol army, led by a grandson of Kublai Khan, marched to Pagan which perished amid the blood and flame of Tartar terror.

The Mongol invasion was followed by political disintegration and cultural decay in Burma for a period of nearly one hundred and fifty years. But Burma once again emerged as a great power and carried its victorious arms as far as Assam in the north and the heart of Siam in the south. But we need not enter into that phase of its history which is comparatively well-known.

## LECTURE IV

### HINDU CULTURE IN SOUTH-EAST ASIA

In the first lecture I have drawn a general picture of the culture and civilization of the indigenous peoples with whom the Hindu colonists first came into contact. They had hardly emerged from the Neolithic state and resembled to a large extent the peoples whom the Aryans met in India. I propose to discuss in this lecture how these primitive peoples were affected by the elements of Hindu culture that were deeply implanted in their soils by the Hindu Colonists.

The first and foremost of these elements was the Sanskrit language and literature which opened, as it were, a new world of culture to the more intelligent among them. Reference has been made above to the large number of inscriptions scattered all over the area. These are written in very good Sanskrit and indicate an acquaintance with various branches of Sanskrit literature. The Vo-Chanh inscription in Champā, belonging to the second or third century A.D., is perhaps the oldest of them. It is written in prose with two verses in *Vasanta-tilakā* metre which show a simple *kāvya* style; but an inscription of Śambhuvārman, a later king of Champā, is marked by a developed *kāvya* style. An idea of the language and the thorough-going spirit of Hindu culture which characterise these early records may be had from the following verse in the last-named inscription.<sup>1</sup>

*Sṛṣṭam yena tritayam = akhilam bhūr-bhuvas-svāḥ svaśaktyā*  
*Yen = otkhātam bhuvana-duritam vahnin = ev = āndhakāram |*  
*Yasy = ācintyo jagati mahimā yasyan = ādir = na cāntaś*  
*Champādeśe janayatu sukham Śambhubhadreśvaro = yam || — ( No. 7 )*

The oldest inscription in Fu-nan dating from the fifth century A.D. is written throughout in poetry, four of its five verses being composed in the very difficult metre known as *Śārdūlavikrīḍita*. The following half-verse, describing the queen shows a familiarity with Hindu mythology.

*Śakrasy = eva Śaci nṛpasya dayitā Svāḥ = eva Saptārcciṣaḥ |*  
*Rudrān = iva Harasya lokaviditā Sā Śrīr = iva Śrīpateḥ || — ( No. 1, v. 4 )*

A very large number of short Sanskrit inscriptions, datable between the fourth and seventh century A.D., have been found in Burma, Siam, Malay Peninsula, Sumatra, Java and Borneo. All these prove that before the end of the seventh century A.D., there were in the Hindu colonies, a deep knowledge of

1 The number of the Inscription given in the text refers to the corresponding number in my Collection of Inscriptions of Champā and Kambuja (see Bibliography under R. C. Majumdar, the first and the last book).



Sanskrit language, intimate acquaintance with Sanskrit literature and a high degree of skill in the use of different metres, including the most difficult ones.

But the progress of Sanskrit in the colonies during the next five hundred years adds a new chapter to the history of that literature. The small Hindu kingdom of Champā has yielded more than fifty Sanskrit inscriptions. They are written both in prose and verse and are good specimens of the high-flown artificial style current in India about the same period. All these are collected in my book on Champā, and anyone who reads them cannot fail to be struck with the rich cultivation of Sanskrit even in this remotest Indian Colony in South-east Asia.

But Kambuja shows a still more wonderful progress in Sanskrit. In a recent work, just published, I have brought together the texts of about one hundred and fifty Sanskrit inscriptions from Kambuja. Most of these inscriptions are written in beautiful and almost flawless Kāvya style, and some of them are quite big compositions. The text of an inscription of Yaśo-varman ( No. 60 ), of which we possess no less than eleven copies in different places, contains fifty verses. Another ( Nos. 62-68 ), with seven copies, contains 108 verses each. A third ( No. 61 ) contains 93 verses of which only 15 are common with the last series. In addition to these there are a large number of records containing about fifty verses, a few more or less. But the *Prasastis* of Rājendra-varman exceed in size and quality even those of Yaśo-varman. The Mebon Ins. of this king ( No. 93 ) contains 218 verses, not a few of which are fairly big, being written in *Śārdūlavikrīḍita* and *Sragdharā* metres. The largest inscription is that of Pre Rup ( No. 97 ) which contains 298 verses. There are many other records of Rājendra-varman and other kings of this period which run to a considerable length.

The authors of these inscriptions have very successfully used almost all the Sanskrit metres, and exhibited a thorough acquaintance with the most developed rules and conventions of Sanskrit rhetoric and prosody. Besides, they show an intimate knowledge of the Indian Epics, *Kāvyas* and *Purāṇas*, and other branches of literature, and a deep penetrating insight into Indian philosophical and spiritual ideas; they are also saturated with the religious and mythological conceptions of the different sects of India;—all this to an extent which may be justly regarded as marvellous in a community separated from India by thousands of miles. It is beyond the scope of this lecture to illustrate these by citing examples from the different inscriptions. But a verse may be quoted to show how they were thoroughly conversant even with the grammatical treatise of Pāṇini:—

*Rājanvaṭ* = *ty* = *anya-nṛpo* = *nvaśāt praṇ*

*Nipātanāl* = *lakṣaṇam* = *antareṇa* |

*Yo lakṣaṇais* = *saṁskṛta-varṇṇavarddhi-*

*Padas* = *tu sādhotva-dharān* = *dharitṛim* ||

( No. 97, V. 48 )

The verse is a pun on the rule of Pāṇini VIII, 2.14 (*rājanvān saurājye*). It makes an exception to the general rule about the elision of the final *n* before the consonant in the word *rājanvān* in the sense of 'having good king', the ordinary form '*rājavān*' meaning only 'having a king'. There are similar references in an inscription of the time of Yaśo-varman:—

*Sad-dharma-nirater = yyasya padam rājyena cakrire ।*

*Upasarggāḥ kriyāyoge te prāg dhātor = mmuner = iva ॥*

(No. 73, B. 13)

Here also the verse is a pun on Pāṇini's *Sūtras* I, 4, 58, 59, 80, and compares king Jaya-varman II with Pāṇini. Similarly V. 94 of Ins. 62 compares king Yaśo-varman with Pāṇini and all the epithets are applicable to both.

The inscriptions show by their general tenor a high proficiency in different branches of Sanskrit literature—not only what is known as *belles-letters* but also various technical branches of that literature. We have specific references to Pravarasena and Mayūra as the authors respectively of *Setubandha* and *Sūrya-śataka*, and to Guṇāḍhya, the great writer in Prakṛit, with allusion to the legend about him contained in *Kathāsaritsāgara*. Although the name of Kālidāsa is not mentioned, the Pre Rup inscription (No. 97) contains four verses (164, 199, 211, 290) which contain definite allusions to *Raghuvamśa*, repeating sometimes the very words used by the poet. Similar allusions occur in several other records. An inscription of Yaśo-varman (No. 64) alludes to Bhāravi, and also to Śūra as having triumphed over a rival named Bhīmaka. A new *Kāvya* named *Manohara* seems to be referred to in Pre Rup inscription (No. 97).

As regards technical sciences, Grammar was highly cultivated. In addition to Pāṇini's *Sūtras* specific reference is made to *Mahābhāṣya* and king Yaśo-varman is said to have composed a commentary on it. His minister was an expert in *Horāśāstra* (astrology). Specific reference is also made to the *Kāma-sūtra* of Vātsyāyana, *Niti-śāstra* of Viśālākṣa and the medical treatise of *Suśruta*.

The inscriptions also refer to the Trayī or Vedas, Atharvaveda, Vedānta, Smṛti, the *Rāmāyaṇa*, the *Mahābhārata*, the sacred canons of the Buddhists and Jinas, religious texts of various Brāhmanical sects, and all the schools of Indian philosophy. Manu is referred to as a legislator, and a verse from the *Manu-Saṁhitā* is reproduced *verbatim* in an inscription.

There is specific reference to Siṁhāvalokitanyāya and Gautama's *Nyāya-sūtra* (No. 66) and the Yogācāra system (No. 97). Jina seems to be cited as the author of one of the Pūrvas named Kalyāṇa.

As we go through these inscriptions we meet at every step with the Purāṇic mythology and legends, and the allusions, alliterations, and similes usually found in Sanskrit literature in India. Special attention may be drawn to the Vat Thipedi Inscription (No. 78) which has a distinct style of its own, the chief characteristics

being the use of long compounds, *atyukti*, i.e. exaggeration, and *anuprāsa*, i.e. the repetition of the same syllables in the same line. According to Sanskrit rhetoricians, these characteristic features mark the Gauḍa style of Sanskrit poetry. The great French savant Coedès thinks that the author of the inscription was probably trained in the Gauḍa country.

On the whole the Sanskrit inscriptions of Kambuja add a brilliant chapter to the history of Sanskrit literature which is mostly unknown in this country. It is interesting to note in this connection the high degree of proficiency in Sanskrit literature attained even by the kings in these Hindu Colonies. Reference has been made above to two such kings of Kambuja named Jaya-varman II and Yaśo-varman. Similar instances occur in the inscriptions of Champā. King Bhadravarman is said to have been versed in the four Vedas while Śrī Jaya Indravarmanadeva VII was versed in grammar, astrology, the Mahāyāna philosophy and the Dharma-śāstras, notably the Nāradiya and the Bhārgaviya. Special interest attaches to the following verse ( Champā, ins. No. 45, v. III ), which describes the learning of Indra-varman III.

*Mīmāṃsa-ṣaṭ-tarka-jinendra-sūrmis-*  
*Sa-Kāśikā-vyākaraṇodak = aughah ṁ*  
*Ākhyāna-Śaivottara-kalpa-mīnaḥ*  
*Paṭiṣṭha eteṣv = iti sātkaṇḍam ṁ*

This verse means that like a fish in water the king could easily move through the different branches of learning named, because even among the learned he was the most skilful in all these subjects. These included Buddhist philosophy, Pāṇini's Grammar with Kāśikā, Ākhyāna, and Uttarakalpa of the Śaivas. There was besides the *Mīmāṃsa-ṣaṭ-tarka* with which the list begins. When I first edited this inscription, I took it as *Mīmāṃsādi ṣaṭ-tarka*, to mean the six systems of Indian philosophy beginning with *Mīmāṃsā*. A learned Indian scholar<sup>2</sup> has since pointed out that the famous poet Rājasekhara in his *Kāvya-mīmāṃsā* has used *ṣaṭ-tarka*, in a special sense, to mean the six logical systems of Buddha, Jaina, Chārvāka, Sāṅkhya, Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika. The expression *Mīmāṃsa-ṣaṭ-tarka* therefore means both *Mīmāṃsā* and the six systems referred to above, As *Mīmāṃsā* includes both Karma-mīmāṃsā and Jñāna-mīmāṃsā or Vedānta, and the Sāṅkhya includes both the atheistic school of Kapila and the theistic Yoga system, *Mīmāṃsā* and *ṣaṭ-tarka* taken together stand for all the commonly known schools of Indian philosophy, both Brāhmanical and non-Brāhmanical. This also follows from the fact that Rājasekhara has divided the Pramāṇikas or the experts in the Pramāṇa Vidyā into two classes, *Mīmāṃsakas* and *Tārkikas*.

The learned scholar, whose views I have quoted above, refers to the date of Rājasekhara as 1000 A.D. But as he was a court poet of the Pratihāra king

Mahendrapāla, he must have flourished towards the end of the ninth or beginning of the tenth century A.D. As the inscription which describes the learning of Indra-varman III of Champā is dated in 840 Śaka or 918 A.D., he was a contemporary of Rājasekhara. As such, we may take *Mīmāṃsā-śat-tarka* in the sense used by Rājasekhara. It not only proves the great erudition of the king of Champā but also a close association between that country and India in respect of literature and philosophy.

There is no doubt that in both Champā and Kambuja Sanskrit was the language of the court and the learned, but it is difficult to determine how far it superseded the local vernaculars. We have very few early specimens of these local languages, but when we come across them in written records, we find them full of Sanskrit words. The vernaculars must have existed side by side with Sanskrit and were largely influenced by them, but they do not appear to have been used in serious compositions with any literary pretensions for which Sanskrit was exclusively employed.

Another Hindu colony which was deeply influenced by Sanskrit literature was Java. It has not preserved many Sanskrit inscriptions or Sanskrit texts, but the rich old-Javanese literature testifies to the extensive influence of Sanskrit. The term old-Javanese is used to indicate the language which was current in Java up to the fall of Majapahit and introduction of Islam. It is formed by a mixture of Sanskrit and the indigenous language. The poetry of the old-Javanese literature follows rules of Sanskrit metre, its subject-matter is derived mainly from Sanskrit literature, and it frequently quotes Sanskrit verses. The earliest book in this language is *Amaramālā*, an old-Javanese version of Sanskrit lexicon *Amarakośa*. To the same period belongs the old-Javanese *Rāmāyaṇa* which agrees quite well with the Sanskrit *Rāmāyaṇa*, but concludes with the re-union of Sītā and Rāma after the death of Rāvaṇa. The next important work is the prose translation of *Mahābhārata*, which closely follows the original epic but is more condensed.

All the above works were composed before 1000 A.D. Next we find a series of works based on the themes supplied by the great epics. The more famous among these are *Arjunavivāha*, *Kṛṣṇāyaṇa* and *Sumanasāntaka*. The last is based on the story of Indumatī's death caused by a garland of flowers thrown from above which has been immortalised by Kālidāsa. The greatest work of this kind is *Bhārata-yuddha*, the grandeur of whose style, according to eminent critics, is comparable to that of the Greek epics. Among other works may be mentioned *Indravijaya*, *Pārthayañña*, *Kālayavanāntaka*, *Harivaṃśa*, *Smaradahana* and *Bhomakāvya*, all dealing with the themes familiar in Sanskrit literature. The Purāṇas are represented by the *Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa* which closely follows the Indian original. The *Nīlīsāra* contains the wise sayings, maxims and moral precepts such as we find in Sanskrit works called *Nīlīsāra*, *Pañcatantra*, *Cāṇakyaśataka*,

etc. In many cases, the Javanese verses are close translations of well-known Sanskrit couplets. There are also folk-tales based on *Hitopadeśa* and *Pañcatantra*, and medical books, erotic treatises and miscellaneous texts on calendar, music and animals. The vast Indo-Javanese literature is a standing testimony to the great influence of Sanskrit literature on that of Java and Bali, and there is perhaps no parallel in the history of literature of such an influence on one literature over another.

The history of Kambuja and Champā on the one hand, and that of Java on the other, exhibit two parallel developments. In the first case, Sanskrit was the dominant language and long cultivated as the form of literary expression, while the indigenous dialect gradually grew under its aegis till it superseded the former as a vehicle of literary expression after the Hindu culture had spent its force in the twelfth or thirteen century A.D. In Java, on the other hand, Sanskrit never attained a dominant position, and the indigenous dialect, though strongly influenced by Sanskrit, attained a highly developed literary form at an early stage. It has left no evidence of original composition in Sanskrit, but bequeathed a large legacy of Indo-Javanese literature. Champā and Kambuja on the other hand can boast of a rich crop of Sanskrit literature, but have left no indigenous literature worth the name.

Next to Sanskrit language the great gift of the Hindu colonists was the art of writing. Indian scripts of different varieties were used in the early records; presumably the colonists introduced the particular type with which they were familiar at home. These scripts, of course, underwent modifications, in course of ages, in different colonies in different ways till they have developed into current scripts of the different regions. Thus, all the different systems of writing that we find in use to-day in the different parts of South-east Asia from Burma to Java originated from the Brāhmī scripts of India. The local modifications followed more or less in the same way as we find in different parts of India, though of course on different lines in different regions. Unlike local language, we find no trace of any local script before the advent of the Aryans. It may, therefore, be regarded as almost certain that the indigenous peoples possessed no script of their own and were taught the use of writing by the Hindu Colonists. Judging from effect upon mental development, the knowledge of the art of writing may be regarded as a dividing line between a distinctly higher and a lower form of culture, and no other single factor has probably contributed so much to the all-round development of a culture. The Hindu colonists, by introducing the art of writing and a highly developed literature like Sanskrit, ushered in a new era in the cultural development of South-east Asia.

By far the most important contribution of the Hindu Colonists was their highly developed form of religion, and if it is mentioned after language and script

it is simply because without these the religious influence of the Hindus upon the local people could not have been so great as it actually became.

With the exception of Jainism all the principal religions of India made their influence felt in the colonies, and in most cases the different religious sects lived peacefully side by side in the same region, thus showing a spirit of toleration truly characteristic of ancient India. As in India during the same period, the religious life was dominated by Buddhism, Śaivism and Vaiṣṇavism.

The Vo-Chanh inscription is adduced as an evidence of the prevalence of Buddhism in Champā in the second or third century A.D.<sup>3</sup> So far as I can see there is nothing specifically Buddhist in this record. But the spread of Buddhism about this period almost all over the region is proved by the discovery of the images of Buddha of the Amarāvati style in Siam, Annam, Sumatra, Java and Celebes. Some of the Buddhist sculptures in Siam reflect the primitive ideas of Buddhism, such as the representation of the Buddha by a symbol rather than his figure. All this indicates the introduction of Buddhism at an early date, possibly during the first two or three centuries of the Christian Era.

The Brāhmanical or Purāṇic religion is represented by the two important sects, Śaivism and Vaiṣṇavism. Images of their gods, so far found, are probably of later date than the early Buddha images. This is also true of India, for worship of images came to be generally accepted by the followers of Śaivism and Vaiṣṇavism at a later date than the Buddhists, and probably in imitation of them. As a matter of fact Brāhmanical images that can be definitely dated before the Gupta age are very rare in India. The absence of such images in Indian colonies does not, therefore, necessarily prove that the Brāhmanical religion was introduced at a later date, nor does it support the inference that the followers of Buddhism were pioneers of Indian colonisation in South-east Asia.

This view is also negated by a stray episode preserved in the Chinese Chronicles about Fu-nan. The king of this country, Jaya-varman, sent some merchants to Canton, in China, for purposes of trade. On their return journey the Indian monk Nāgasena joined them and arrived at Fu-nan on his way to India. In A.D. 484, Jaya-varman sent Nāgasena as an envoy to China on a political mission. This Buddhist monk, while describing the manners and customs of Fu-nan, referred to the dominant cult of Maheśvara. In 503 A.D. Jaya-varman again sent an embassy to the imperial court with present including an image of Buddha. This indicates that while Buddhism and Śaivism were both prevalent in Fun-nan, the latter had larger number of adherents.

So far as epigraphical evidence is concerned, all the three religious sects come into prominence about the same time.

3 Coedès—*Etats*, 74. Sastri—*S. Ind. Infl.* 28.

The two oldest inscriptions of Fu-nan are Vaisṇavite in character. The first begins with an invocation to Viṣṇu and records the pious donations of Kulaprabhāvatī, the chief queen of Jaya-varman. She installed a golden image of a god in Kurūmbanagara, inhabited by Brāhmaṇas, and also built an *ārāma* ( a park or a hermitage ) with a tank and a dwelling house. The next inscription records the consecration of a footprint of Viṣṇu, called Cakratīrthasvāmin, by Guṇa-varman, probably a son of Jaya-varman and Kulaprabhāvatī. The third inscription, belonging to the region of Rudra-varman, is too fragmentary to yield a complete sense. It begins with an invocation to Buddha and contains the eulogy of a Brāhmaṇa and his family.

Reference has been made above to the worship of the footprint of Viṣṇu, which is quite well-known in India. But we also find mention of the footprint of Śiva being held equally sacred in Kambuja ( No. 8 ). We learn from a record that a pious Brāhmaṇa consecrated the representation of a foot of Śiva and a cistern for the ablution of the god, on the top of a hillock. In the year 526 Śaka ( = 604 A.D. ) the representation of the divine foot was surrounded by a brick wall. The human figure of Śiva was also quite well-known. A fine image of Śiva with Pārvatī, seated on the left thigh of the god, was installed in the year 535 Śaka ( = 613 A.D. ). The references to *liṅga* are numerous.

The different sects also made their influence felt in this distant region. Reference is made to the Bhāgavatas in a Kambuja inscription of sixth century A.D. ( No. 2 ). Another inscription, dating from about the middle of the 7th century A.D., refers to a god Śrī-Trailokyasāra and a sacrificer versed in the rites of Pāñcarātra sect. The relevant verse is as follows:—

*Yajvanā pañcabhir = yajñaiḥ pañca-kal-ābhigāminā ।*

*Pañcarātr-ārcā—cuñcunā pañca-bhautika-vedinā ॥*

( No. 72A )

The Pāśupatas make their appearance as early as the 6th century A.D. An inscription of this period refers to an endowment to god Śiva, managed by the Pāśupatas, made by their *ācārya*, named Vidyāpuṣpa, well versed in grammar and philosophy ( *Śabda-Vaiśeṣika-Nyāyatattvārtha-kṛta-niścayaḥ* ). After wandering to many holy places he was directed, in a dream, by the god Śankara and established a *liṅga* on the Tuṅgiśa-parvata. This god came to be known as Tuṅgiśa even in later times.

Two other interesting phases of religious life were the existence, side by side of gods with Sanskrit and indigenous names, and elaborate arrangements made for the worship of divine images in temples with the help of rich endowments. The following summary of an inscription throws interesting light on both these point.

The inscription begins with the date 533 Śaka and enumerates the gift of 7 slaves, 60 bulls, 2 buffaloes, 10 she-goats, 40 coconut trees and some paddy

fields to ( the god ) Kpoñ Kamratāñ Añ; 7 slaves, 20 bulls, women who take to religious life, a person for fixing holy days, flowers, and perfumes to the god Mahāgaṇapati.

Another gift to a god whose name has disappeared, and whose property was amalgamated with that of another god Kamratāñ Teñ Krom, comprises 7 dancing girls, 11 songstresses, 4 players on *Vīṇā* ( lyre ), *Kañjan* ( *Khañjani*? ) and *rahv* ( ? ), 57 slaves for the paddy field, 100 bulls, 20 buffaloes, paddy fields in various localities, and a kitchen-garden.

It is hardly necessary to add that with the growth of the Kambuja empire the religious endowments also increased to a proportionate degree. The epigraphic records contain numerous references to these. We need only refer to the royal donations described in Ta Prohm Inscription ( No. 177 ). It concerns the Rājavihāra, *i.e.* the temple of Ta Prohm and its adjuncts where the king set up an image of his mother as Prajñā-pāramitā. It is not possible here to record all the details, but a few facts may be noted. Altogether 66,625 persons were employed in the service of the deities of the temple and 3,400 villages were given for defraying its expenses. There were 439 Professors and 970 scholars studying under them, making a total of 1,409, whose food and other daily necessities of life were supplied. There were altogether 566 groups of stone houses and 288 groups of brick. Needless to say that the other articles, of which a minute list is given, were in the same proportion, and they included huge quantities of gold and silver, 35 diamonds, 40,620 pearls and 4,540 other precious stones. All these relate to a single group of temples. And the inscription informs us that there were 798 temples and 102 hospitals in the whole kingdom, and there are given every year 117,200 *khārikās* of rice, each *khārikā* being equivalent to 3 *maunds*, 8 *seers*. In conclusion the king expresses the hope that by his pious donations, his mother might be delivered from the ocean of births.

There are many other interesting features in the religious life of Kambuja, but it is not possible even to touch upon them in course of this lecture. We may now pass on to the neighbouring kingdom of Champā. As regards this kingdom, the oldest inscription, *viz.* that at Vo-Chanh, does not, as we have said above, refer to any religion in the extant portion. The next six inscriptions refer to Śaivism. As noted above, king Bhadra-varman, who flourished about A.D. 400, and had the epithet Dharma-mahārāja, erected a temple of Śiva, under the name Bhadreśvara-svāmin. The inscriptions of his reign, and good many inscriptions in later ages, refer to this temple which became the national sanctuary of the Chams. This temple was destroyed by an incendiary and then king Śambhu-varman ( 6th-7th century A.D. ) re-installed the god under the name Śambhu-Bhadreśvara. One of the inscriptions refers to a sacrifice, probably of a human being, before the god, and three inscriptions describe the boundaries of the domi-



nions endowed to the temple. It should be noted however that one of the inscriptions of Bhadra-varman begins as follows:

“ Reverence to Maheśvara and Umā, to Brahmā and Viṣṇu.

Reverence to the Earth, Wind, Sky, Water and fifthly the Fire.” (No. 4)

Thus though the dominant cult was that of Śiva, there was no exclusive sectarian spirit, and we find a recognition of the Purāṇic Trinity and demi-gods.

It is not till we come to the reign of Prakāśadharma, who ascended the throne before A.D. 653, that we get a reference to Vaiṣṇavism. He built a temple of God Viṣṇu Puruṣottama, and another of Vālmiki, who is described as an incarnation of Viṣṇu. But the king also made donations to the Śaiva gods Śambhu-Bhadreśvara, Iśāneśvara and Prabhāseśvara. It is interesting to note that while in one of his records Viṣṇu is referred to as ‘ without beginning or end and preceptor of the whole world ’ ( No. 11 ), another record describes Śiva as “ the one lord of all the world and the cause of its creation, with different forms like Earth etc. for the maintenance and progress of the world who although revered by Brahmā, Viṣṇu, Indra and other gods, yet danced in cemetery for the sake of prosperity of the world; and from whom is evolved this static and dynamic world; like rays from the Sun, and in whom again are they merged.” The king erected a temple to this God “ with a view to destroy the seeds of *Karma* which have the power of leading to births in quick succession ” ( No. 12 ). The same king also erected, for increase of wealth, temple of Kubera, the friend of Maheśvara, and also called ‘ *Ekākṣapiṅgala* ’ for having his eye injured by the view of the goddess Umā ( No. 14 ).

The religious attitude of king Prakāśadharma may be regarded as typical of the country, and shows a complete assimilation of true Indian spirit, and a wide knowledge of Purāṇic religion, including its philosophy and mythology.

Although an early image of Buddha was found at Dong Duong in Champā, the first epigraphic reference to Buddhism occurs in an inscription in the same place dated A.D. 875. Buddhism, though introduced at an early date, thus seems to have been confined to that locality, and does not appear to have enjoyed great popularity in Champā.

As regards Malay Peninsula, reference has already been made to short records, temples and images testifying to the prevalence of both Buddhism and Brāhmanical religion at least as early as the fourth or fifth century A.D. It is interesting to note that the well-known Buddhist formula *ye dharmā hetuṃ prabhavā* etc., occurs in an inscription with an additional verse which alone is found in another record.

More interesting still is an inscribed clay tablet found in the neighbourhood of Keddah. It contains three Sanskrit verses embodying Mahāyānist philosophical doctrines of Mādhyamika School. All the three verses have been traced to-

gether in a Chinese translation of the *Sāgaramatipariṣcchā* of which the original is lost.

The prevalence of Śaiva religion is proved by the discoveries at Sungai Batu at the foot of Keddah Peak. These include an image of goddess Durgā triumphing over Maṇiṣāsura ( ? ), the head of Nandī ( Śiva's Bull ) and a yoni.<sup>4</sup>

The spirit of religious toleration is shown by an inscription found near Ligor which records endowments for the worship both of Pāramitā and Agastya.<sup>5</sup>

The state of religion in Siam proper seems to resemble that of Malay Peninsula. A little statuette of walking Buddha and other remains at Pong Tuk indicate the prevalence of Buddhism at a very early period. Images of both Brāhmanical and Buddhist deities of the Gupta style have been found all over the country. A Sanskrit inscription of the fourth century A.D. has been found at Si Tep along with Śaiva and Vaiṣṇava sculptures. Inscriptions containing Pali Buddhist texts of somewhat later period have also come to light.

As regards Burma, there is a general belief that Buddhism was introduced in this country during the reign of Aśoka. This belief rests upon the tradition, recorded in the Ceylonese chronicles, that two religious missionaries named Soṇa and Uttara, sent by Aśoka, visited Suvarṇabhūmi. This Suvarṇabhūmi has been identified with Burma by many scholars. But some have identified it with Siam, while others regard it as general designation of South-east Asia. Although the identification of Suvarṇabhūmi with Burma, and even the very tradition of Aśoka's mission to that land may be regarded as doubtful; the introduction of Buddhism in Burma must be placed at an early date. A great deal of importance attaches in this connection to the testimony of Buddhaghōṣa, the famous commentator of Pāli canon, who lived in the beginning of the fifth century A.D. He not only places the scene of activities of Aśoka's missionaries in Burma, but also regards as natives of the same country the two merchants who became the first disciples of the Buddha shortly after he attained Bodhi at Buddha-Gayā. These stories may not be true, but the very fact that Buddhaghōṣa recorded them at the beginning of the fifth century A.D. proves that even learned people of that age regarded the introduction of Buddhism into Burma as reaching back to hoary antiquity.

No positive evidence of the prevalence of Buddhism in Burma is, however, forthcoming till the fourth or fifth century A.D. The most important evidence is furnished by the texts of Pāli canon engraved on gold plates, stone and terra-cotta in scripts which have been referred to A.D. 500. These have been found round about Prome, mostly at Moza and Maungun. They prove the existence of Theravāda sects, but I-tsing tells us that the Mūlasarvāstivāda sect also flourish-

4 Winstedt. *History of Malaya*, p. 21.

5 Coedès, *Ins. of Siam*, II. 51.

ed there. It appears, moreover, that both Hinayāna and Mahāyāna and even Tāntrik form of Buddhism prevailed in Burma in addition to the Theravāda.

A number of images both Brāhmanical and Buddhist have been found in Burma. These prove that both Śaivism and Vaiṣṇavism were known, but the latter seems to have been in greater favour.

The four inscriptions of Pūrṇa-varman in Java do not specifically refer to any religion, but the fact that he paid a fee (*dakṣinā*) of a thousand cows to the Brāhmaṇas shows that he was a follower of the Brāhmanical religion. Fortunately, we have more positive evidence regarding the state of religion in Java. The Chinese pilgrim Fa-hien, who stayed in that island for five months on his return journey to China in A.D. 414-5, observes that "various forms of error and Brāhmanism are flourishing, while Buddhism in it is not worth mentioning." But that Buddhism soon made its influence felt in Java appears clearly from the story of Guṇavarman preserved in a Chinese text called "Biography of Monks" compiled in A.D. 519. Guṇavarman belonged to an Indian royal family but adopted the life of a Buddhist monk and visited Ceylon, Java and China. In Java he converted the king's mother to Buddhism and she persuaded her son to adopt the same faith. It is said that about this time Java was attacked by hostile troops and the king asked Guṇavarman whether it would be contrary to Buddhist law if he fought against his enemy. Guṇavarman replied that it was the duty of everybody to punish the robbers. The king then went to fight and obtained a great victory. Gradually the religion was spread throughout the kingdom.

The inscriptions of Mūla-varman in Borneo prove the prevalence of Brāhmanical religion. These are recorded on pillars which are specifically referred to as *yūpa* or sacrificial pillar set up by the Brāhmaṇas. One inscription refers to the sacrifice called Bahu-suvarṇakam (much-gold). Another inscription probably refers to three other-sacrifices. It says that king Mūla-varman has done many pious deeds, viz. Kalpa-vṛkṣa, Bhūmi-dāna and Go-sahasrikā. A third inscription refers to jala-dhenu, ghṛta-dhenu, tila-dāna and Kapilā-dāna. All these are included in the sixteen Mahādānas or Great-Gifts denoting so many sacrificial performances. So the first three should be taken as specific sacrifices rather than in the general sense of gift of Kalpa-tree, land and cows, as most scholars have done. This view is supported by the concluding phrase: "Hence the Brāhmaṇas have set up this pillar." For, the setting up of a *yūpa* or pillar is appropriate in a sacrificial performance, but has no meaning in case of an ordinary gift. Another inscription refers to the gift of 20,000 cows to the Brāhmaṇas. This was also presumably the Mahādāna called Go-sahasrikā, as it was commemorated by a *yūpa*-pillar. This gift was made in the holy field of Vaprakeśvara a name also known in India. Another inscription refers to gift of forty thousand and again of thirty thousand (cows ?) in the same place. It would thus appear

that the religion followed by Mūlavarman was Vedic rather than Purāṇic in character. But reference is made to illumination and *ākāśa-dīpa* which probably refers to Purāṇic rites.

The prevalence of Purāṇic religion in Borneo is proved by the golden image of Viṣṇu, at Muara Kaman, and those of Śiva, Gaṇeśa, Nandī, Agastya, Nandī-śvara, Brahmā, Skanda and Mahākāla in a cave at Kombeng. Images of Buddha and seven short records containing Buddhist formulae prove the existence of Buddhism also at an early date.

The multiplicity of popular gods and religious beliefs is expressed in an inscription of Champā (No. 31B—V. 7) as follows:

“ In some places Indra, Brahmā and Viṣṇu, in some places Vāsuki, in some places Śaṅkara, in some places ascetics (*ṛsis*), Sun, Moon, Varuṇa, Agni, and in some places images of Abhayada ( Buddha ) appeared for the deliverance of creatures. ”

Many Purāṇic legends are also referred to in the inscriptions. The sacredness of the river Gaṅgā is implied in an inscription of Central Java, while the term *rājarsi* is applied to the grandfather of king Pūrṇavarman of Western Java. Reference is also made to the Kṛta-yuga when Dharma prevailed in its entirety, and to the Kali-yuga, full of evils. These indicate that even popular religious or semi-religious beliefs, current in India, were prevalent in the colonies.

The facts stated above leave no doubt that all the essential features of Indian religion penetrated to South-east Asia during the first five hundred years of Hindu colonisation. The numerous Sanskrit inscriptions of Champā and Kambuja, the Indo-Javanese literature, the Buddhist religion still prevailing in Burma, Siam and Cambodia, and the Brāhmanical religion even now practised in the island of Bali show the continuity of the religious tradition and its wide development in course of time. The ruins of temples and hundreds of images of deities scattered all over Indo-China and Indonesia, supplement the account. In general, it may be said that there is hardly any important feature or detail of Indian religion which is not to be found in South-east Asia. From the sublimest forms and ideas of Buddhist and Brāhmanical sects down to the most debased form of Tāntrism—everything can be traced in this far off region. As regards images of deities, the following observation of Crawford in respect of Java, which has been a Muslim country for more than four hundred years, is illuminating: “ Genuine Hindu images in brass and stone exist throughout Java in such variety that I imagine there is hardly a personage of the Hindu mythology of whom it is usual to make representation that there is not a statue of. ”

The Sanskrit inscriptions of Kambuja throw a great deal of light on the religious and spiritual life of the people. They give evidence of the minute knowledge of the rules, regulations and practices of religion, particularly of the Śaiva

and Vaiṣṇava sects, and show a thorough acquaintance not only with the various gods and goddesses in their numerous names and forms but also with the philosophical conceptions lying behind them. The prominent place occupied by religion in the life of the people is also demonstrated by the large number of temples and images erected and installed by kings and others. Most of the inscriptions refer to these pious foundations, and ruins of many of them are now lying scattered all over the country. But what strikes one more is that we find in Kambuja not only the external forms of Indian religion but that ethical and spiritual view of life which was the most distinguishing feature of ancient Indian civilization. Anyone who carefully studies the inscriptions of Kambuja cannot fail to be struck with the spirit of piety and renunciation, a deep yearning for emancipation from the trammels of birth and evils of the world, and a longing for the attainment of the highest bliss by union with Brahman, which are frequently referred to and expressed with beauty and elegance in language at once sombre and serene.

Reference should also be made in this connection to the *āśramas* or monastic establishments which formed the real centres of Hindu culture in Kambuja. Many inscriptions refer to these *āśramas* and king Yaśo-varman is said to have founded one hundred of them. An inscription ( No. 60 ), of which twelve copies have been found in different localities, refers to the royal endowments to these *āśramas* and their detailed regulations. There is no doubt that each of these records marks the locality of an *āśrama*. In addition to these there are three other inscriptions ( 66-68 ) which contain royal ordinances respectively for the Vaiṣṇavāśrama, Brāhmaṇāśrama and Saugatāśrama. The second of these is really meant for a Śaiva *āśrama*, and the use of the general term Brāhmaṇa for Śaiva is an interesting evidence for the dominance of that cult.

Each of these *āśramas* was in charge of a head called *Kulādhyakṣa* and was primarily a seat of higher learning and religious and spiritual practices. It also showed hospitality to all kinds of people in strict accordance with detailed rules and regulations for each category of guests. With the exception of the king whoever passes in front of the *āśrama* shall get down from his chariot and walk uncovered by an umbrella. No one seeking refuge in the *āśramas* out of fear shall be surrendered until his guilt is proved. It is not possible here to dwell at length upon these regulations, which should be studied in full in order to understand the culture of the people. These are highly interesting and throw a flood of light upon the monastic life in Kambuja. We do not possess any such records for the religious sanctuaries of ancient India, on which they were obviously modelled.

The twelve records, containing these regulations, referred to above are, diagraphic i.e. their texts are first written in the current Kambuja alphabet and then repeated in the North Indian alphabet of the time. Some of the texts are

written in North Indian alphabet alone. This has proved very puzzling. I think the text was written in North Indian alphabet because there was a stream of visitors from North India who were yet unfamiliar with Kambuja alphabet. They might have been ascetics or pilgrims who went there for short periods. According to this view, the diagraphic inscriptions would be very strong evidence of an intimate relation between India and Kambuja.

Along with religion, Hindu social customs were also introduced in the colonies. The caste-system, which is the distinctive feature of the Hindu society, was introduced more or less in all the colonies, though we know more details of it in case of Java, Madura, Sumatra and Bali. The word *Caturvarṇa* occurs in the early records, and there is frequent reference to the Brāhmaṇas, Kṣatriyas, Vaiśyas and Śūdras in literature and inscriptions. But the rigours of the caste-system in respect of inter-dining and inter-marriage were wanting. It should be remembered that this was also true of earlier period in India. As a matter of fact, the caste-system, as described in *Manu-saṁhitā*, prevails in its essential features even to-day among the people of Bali. It may be presumed that this was also the case in many of the colonies even in earlier times.

As in India, the Brāhmaṇas and the Kṣatriyas occupied the higher position, and frequent references made in the epigraphic records to the former leave no doubt that they were large in number and, both as priests and repositories of learning, were looked upon with great respect and reverence. An inscription of Champā (No. 12) refers to the Brāhmaṇas as gods among men (*naradeva*) to whom even the king paid obedience. But the Kṣatriyas and Brāhmaṇas inter-married. King Rudra-varman of Champā had a Brāhmaṇa father and a Kṣatriya mother, and he is called in an inscription 'the ornament of the Brahma-Kṣatriya family.' It may be noted that such inter-marriage as well as the Brahma-Kṣatriya caste was well-known in India.

The inter-marriage between the royal and priestly families was of frequent occurrence in Kambuja. There was a very close association between the spiritual and secular heads in that country. Eminent Brāhmaṇa *ācāryas* took charge of the education of princes, and members of the royal family not unoften became High Priests.

The Brāhmaṇas played a dominant part in the religious life of the colonies from the very beginning. An early inscription of Fu-nan mentions a village inhabited by the Brāhmaṇas. Another refers to the Brāhmaṇas versed in Vedas, Vedaṅgas and Upavedas. An inscription of Kambuja of the sixth century A.D. refers to an *ācārya* of Pāsupata sect well-versed in *śāstra* or grammar and the two philosophical systems known as Nyāya and Vaiśeṣika. Another inscription of the same date refers to a Brāhmaṇa who was foremost among those who knew *Sāma-veda*. He made a gift of the texts of *Rāmāyaṇa*, *Mahābhārata* and

the Purāṇas to a temple, and made arrangements for their daily recitation. This refers to a very interesting practice, well-known in India, which must have helped a great deal in moulding the religious life of the people.

Some Brāhmaṇas attained a very high distinction. The most interesting account of such a Brāhmanical family is supplied by the Sdok Kak Thom Inscription ( No. 152 ) dated 1052 A.D. It is a long record of 340 lines of which 194 are in Sanskrit and 146 in Khmer. It relates how Jaya-varman II, king of Kambuja, invited a Brāhmaṇa named Hiranyadāma in order to perform some Tāntrik rites so that Kambuja might no longer be dependent on Java. This Brāhmaṇa, who came from Janapada, probably in India, established the worship of Devarāja which became the tutelary deity of Kambuja. The Tāntrik texts named in this connection are well-known in India. Hiranyadāma then initiated Śivakaivalya, the royal priest, into the mysteries of this worship, and the king gave a pledge that henceforth only the members of Śivakaivalya's family would function as priests. The record shows that this family supplied the royal priest in Kambuja from 802 to 1052 A.D. The record has preserved the names of all the priests, and gives a catalogue of the pious works and religious foundations of each of them, and a list of the various favours in the shape of honours, dignities, grant of lands etc. which each received from his royal patron. Such an interesting history of priestly Brāhmaṇa family, extending over 250 years, is without a parallel in the history of India and her colonies.

The case of Hiranyadāma shows how the religious life of Kambuja was sustained and fostered by a close constant and intimate contact with India. There are other examples of such intercourse recorded in Kambuja inscriptions. Rājā-lakṣmī, the daughter of Rājendra-varman and the younger sister of Jaya-varman, was married to an Indian Brāhmaṇa Divākara Bhaṭṭa who was born on the banks of the river Kālindī or Yamunā, sacred with the association of Kṛiṣṇa's boyhood ( No. 111 ). One of the ancestors of Yaśo-varman's mother, Agastya, is said to be a Brāhmaṇa of Āryadeśa versed in Vedas and Vedāṅgas ( Nos. 60-62 ). Another Brāhmaṇa, named Sarvajñamuni, versed in the four Vedas and all the āgamas, and devoted to Śiva, was born in Āryadeśa ( No. 111 ). He came to Kambudeśa and his descendants occupied high religious offices. There are many other less specific references to such migrations. There is also evidence that the learned Brāhmaṇas of Kambuja visited India. The most important instance is that of Śivasoma, the guru of Indra-varman. We learn from an inscription ( No. 54 ) that Śivasoma was the grandson of king Śrī Jayendrādhipati-varman, maternal uncle of Jaya-varman II, and that he learnt the *sāstras* from Bhagavat-Śaṅkara whose lotus-feet were touched by the heads of all the sages. It has been rightly conjectured by the editor of the Inscription, that the reference here is undoubtedly to the famous Śaṅkarācārya, and presumably Śivasoma must have come to India to sit at the feet of the venerable Śaṅkara.

While the Brāhmaṇas and Kṣatriyas are frequently mentioned, we do not find many specific references to the Vaiśyas and Sūdras, at least in early records. It seems that the society had really two broad divisions; the higher one composed of Brāhmaṇas and Kṣatriyas, who were two classes rather than castes, and the lower one consisting of the remaining people.

An interesting account of the people of Fu-nan is given in a Chinese text composed at the beginning of the sixth century A.D. It shows the great changes that had come over them as a result of the Indian colonization. The most important of these was the wearing of clothes. As mentioned above, both men and women went about naked when Kauṇḍinya first landed in the country about the first century A.D. Even the Nāga princess he married had no clothes on. But we read in the Chinese account mentioned above that the men of noble families use *Sarong* made of brocade. The poor people covered their bodies with a piece of cloth.

The people were used to luxury. Their articles of trade were gold, silver and silk. They used golden rings and bracelets and silver vessels, and arranged cock-fight and pig-fight for their amusement. They constructed boats 80 to 90 ft. long and 6 or 7 ft. wide, the front and back of which were shaped like the head and tail of a fish. The king lived in a storeyed pavilion. When going out he rode on elephants. The women also used to ride on elephants. The trial by ordeals, specially those by fire and water, was known there.

The luxury and wealth of the other colonies is also referred to in the Chinese texts. The following account of Po-li is preserved in the *History of the Liang Dynasty*: "The king's family name is Kauṇḍinya. He uses a texture of flowered silk wrapped round his body; on his head he wears a golden bonnet of more than a span high and adorned with various precious stones. He carries a sword inlaid with gold, and sits on a golden throne, with his feet on a silver footstool. His female attendants are adorned with golden flowers and all kinds of jewels, some of them holding *chowries* of white feathers or fans of peacock feathers. When the king goes out, his carriage, which is made of different kinds of fragrant wood, is drawn by an elephant. On the top of it is a flat canopy of feathers, and has embroidered curtains on both sides. People blowing conches and beating drums precede and follow him."

If in the above account we understand by the carriage, the *howdah*, which it probably really means, the above description would apply to many rulers of Indian States even in recent times.

The booty taken by the Chinese from time to time after the sack of Champā throws interesting light on the wealth and social condition of the country. In 446 A.D. they took 100,000 pounds of pure gold. In 605 A.D. they took the



golden tablets of eighteen kings, 1350 Buddhist manuscripts and also some music. This shows that music was also cultivated in Champā.

An idea of the wealth of the colonies may also be formed from the rich endowments to temples of which we get a detailed description in a large number of epigraphic records, and some of which have been referred to above.

Reference should also be made to two institutions which have a direct bearing on the material wealth and physical welfare of the people. These are the Vahnigṛhas or *dharmadālās* and hospitals. King Jaya-varman VII of Kambuja founded 121 Vahnigṛhas and 102 Hospitals. Of the latter the site of fifteen can be determined by means of inscriptions which record their foundations. These inscriptions are almost identical and lay down detailed regulations about the hospitals. They give us a very good idea of the system of medical treatment organised by the state.

The noble sentiment which inspired the king to found these hospitals may be gathered from the following verse:

“ *Dehinām deha-rogo yan-manorogo rujattardm*

*Rāṣṭra duḥkham hi bhartṛṇām duḥkhan = duḥkhan = tu n = ātmanah*

(No. 171, V. 13)

The bodily pain of the diseased became in him (king Jaya-varman VII) a mental agony more tormenting than the former. For the real pain of a king is the pain of his subjects, not that of his own (body). ”

Generally speaking the position of a woman seems to have been much better than in India, both as regards social status and political rights. Of these we get clear evidence in Java. Javanese women could rule in their own rights and occupied high offices of State. A woman could possess property in her own name with rights to dispose of it according to her own will. There does not appear to be any *pardah* system in vogue and the women freely mixed with men. This is evident from literature as well as the present custom in Bāli. Women could choose their own husbands and there seems to be no restriction as to the degree of relationship within which marriage was prohibited. There is an actual instance of marriage with a step-sister.

High ideals of conjugal relation are held in literature and we also come across actual examples in life. The *Satī* system prevailed, at least in Bali, though in later periods it came to be confined to royal families, where sometimes even the slaves and concubines of the dead perished with him. In some cases the wife first killed herself by the sword and then her body was placed on the funeral pyre.

Reference may be made in this connection to the two inscriptions mentioned on p. 71 recording endowments to temples. These include, in the first case, ‘women who take to religious life.’ The expression in Khmer literally

means "females who enter into religion for the sacrificer (*yajamāna*) of the god." Although the exact meaning is not quite clear, it is not difficult to recognise in them the "devadāsīs" of Indian temples. I do not think there is any reference to this class in Indian inscriptions of such early period. This raises the question whether such pernicious custom originated in India or was derived from contact with countries where moral laxity of this type among females is known to have prevailed in more obnoxious form even in later times.

The second inscription refers to the dancing girls, musicians and slaves. The names of the dancing girls were Chārumatī, Priyāsena, Aruṇamatī, Madana-priyā, Samarāsena and Vasantamallikā (the name of the seventh not mentioned). The musicians were called Tanvaṅgī, Guṇadhārī, Dayitavatī, Sārāṅgī, Payodharī, Ratimatī, Stanottarī, Ratibindu, Manovatī, Sakhipriyā, Madhurasena, Gandhinī and Vinayavatī. The names of the slaves and servants were mostly indigenous with a few exceptions, such as Śivadāsa, Bhāgya, Prasāda, Jyeṣṭha-varmā, Daśamī, Mañjarī etc.

The personal names of dancing and musician girls, laying great stress their physical charms, are very interesting relics of the fashions of old times of which we have no exact counterpart in Indian literary records. The existence of the Indian and indigenous names among these and the slaves, both male and female, raises an important issue. It may be supposed on the analogy of known instances, that Indian colonists occupied higher ranks in life and were not likely to be included in these low professions or status in life. This would mean that the indigenous people or those who were born of their union with the Indians, bore purely Indian names. At the same time indigenous names never went out of use. The Kambuja inscriptions have preserved many hundreds of personal names which are both interesting and instructive and throw a flood of light on the degree of Indianization in Kambuja society.

---

## LECTURE V

### HINDU ART IN SOUTH-EAST ASIA

Next to religion and society, we find the greatest influence of Indian culture in the domain of art. Except megaliths, crude images, and primitive ornamental designs such as are commonly found in neolithic culture, we have no evidence of the development of art in these regions before the arrival of the Hindus. But the Hindu colonists brought with them not only traditions and technique of developed Indian art, but also probably actual specimens of Indian sculpture. Some of the earlier sculptures in Siam and Malay Peninsula bear so striking a resemblance to Indian prototypes that many scholars have held that they were either brought from India or made by Hindu craftsmen who were fresh arrivals from India. For not only the motifs and the general details but even the very technique was purely Indian, and there was hardly anything to distinguish them from Indian products. But this state of things did not continue long. Gradually local styles developed in different regions with special characteristics of their own, each of which, in its final form, showed considerable divergence from the Indian models. In many cases they equalled the best Indian examples, and in some cases, specially in architecture, they excelled, both in refinement and in massive grandeur, anything that has yet come to light in India. But whatever may be the quality or character of the colonial art in different regions, the fact remains that influence of Indian styles may be traced in all stages of its development.

The above observations apply both to architecture and sculpture of the different colonial kingdoms, notably, Burma, Siam, Annam, Cambodia, and Java which have left quite a large number of specimens of both.

As regards architecture, the early examples, mostly built of perishable materials, have vanished. But enough remains to indicate that the early temples, built of brick, faithfully represent the Indian prototype of a square shrine with or without projections and niches. In the latter case the bare walls are divided by pilasters. The walls stand on a base and support a cornice with arched niches or *kuḍus*. Above it rises the roof in three or four storeys of receding stages, each showing the characteristic features of the main temple in miniature.

Such examples are furnished by Pre-Angkorean temples in Cambodia, and the temples in Champā and Central Java. While discussing the origin of these temples in Champā, Parmentier, the great French authority on Art, held that this art was not traceable in the old Indian style. This view was challenged by me in my book on Champā published in 1927. Since then there has been a great change

of views in this respect. In his latest book<sup>1</sup> Parmentier has made a painstaking analysis of the common elements between the architecture of India and South-east Asia, and has frankly admitted that both the temples and *stupas*, in the Indian colonies derive not only their basic plan but also their general moulding and decoration from Indian models. He has even traced the influence of Hindu architecture in the temples of China, Japan, Korea and Annam. Nevertheless, Parmentier's views about this type of temples in India do not seem to be very accurate, and this question will be dealt with at length at the end of this lecture.

But starting from the normal Indian type there was a considerable evolution of the temple architecture, particularly in Cambodia in the Angkor period. Here we find the addition of three new features, viz the galleries, the pyramidal construction in several stages, and high central towers, sometimes capped by four human heads facing the four cardinal directions. The gallery consists of a long narrow chamber with a vaulted roof supported by a wall on one side and a series of pillars on the other. Sometimes it has a *verandah*, with a half-vaulted roof of lower height, also supported by columns. These galleries surrounded the main shrine on all sides, leaving a vacant space between the two. As they were repeated at each higher stage, their walls furnished considerable space for decorative sculptures and were fully utilised for this purpose. These features are shown at their best in the Angkor Vat which may be regarded as the *chef d'oeuvre* of Kambuja art, though sometimes this honour is given to Bayon Temple, constructed on the same principle. An idea of the massive grandeur of these temples may be obtained from the following measurements of Angkor Vat. The moat or ditch surrounding the temple and running close to its boundary walls is more than 650 ft. wide. This is spanned by a broad stone causeway leading to a gate in the wall of enclosure. This wall, which completely surrounds the temple, has a total length of two miles and a half. The broad paved avenue which runs from the western gateway to the first gallery is 520 yds. long and raised 7 ft. above the ground. The first gallery measures 265 yds. east to west and 224 from north to south, with a total running length of nearly 1,000 yds. The central tower, on the third or highest gallery, rises to a height of more than 210 ft.

An interesting innovation in decoration is the balustrade formed by the figures of a series of giants pulling the body of a serpent, generally regarded as representing the churning of ocean.

The *stūpa* of Barabudur in Java is justly regarded as a wonder of the world. It really consists of a series of nine successive terraces, each receding from the one beneath it, and the whole is crowned by a bell-shaped *stūpa* at the centre of the topmost terrace. The five lower terraces have double projections on each side and are enclosed on the inner side by a wall supporting a balustrade, so that

1. 'L' Art Architectural Hindu Dans L'Inde et en Extrême Orient': Paris, 1948.

four successive galleries are formed between the back of the balustrade of one terrace and the wall of the next higher one. The three uppermost terraces are encircled by a ring of *stūpas*, each containing an image of Buddha within a perforated framework. There is no doubt that the whole structure was intended as a *stūpa*, pure and simple, but the disproportion between the actual *stūpa* on the top and the massive support in the shape of nine terraces is difficult to explain, and has given rise to a great deal of speculation. It has been viewed as a novel principle of construction, but then we have neither any precedent nor any imitation of it. Mystic meaning has been attributed to the shape of the entire structure, but it is too speculative. Perhaps the simplest and the most rational explanation is furnished by the nature of the soil. When the first terrace was constructed as the real base of the great dome, it sank considerably and showed that the soil was unable to bear the weight of a huge solid domical *stūpa* as was originally contemplated. Hence the size of the *stūpa* was considerably diminished and the addition of successive terraces was a constructional necessity rather than the introduction of a new style.

The most striking features of Barabudūr are the series of sculptured panels, about fifteen hundred in number, and no less than 432 images of Dhyānī Buddhas which may be regarded as the best specimens of sculpture in the Indian colonies, rivalling, if not surpassing, the very best that India can show.

There is no doubt that the temples in Kambuja mentioned above and the *stūpa* of Barabudūr show a remarkable evolution of art from the simple beginnings introduced by Indian colonists. These, as well as other examples of architecture and sculpture exhibit features which are not to be found in India and must be regarded as of local growth. Some features, however, like the Kāla-makara head in Java, which are regarded as original contribution of the Javanese, have their counterparts in India. But even freely admitting the existence of new features, both in architecture and sculpture, the general proposition stated at the outset of this lecture holds good. The massive monuments in the different Hindu colonies, even in their most developed forms of diverse types, are clearly evolved, step by step, from the original Indian prototype, and even the very best sculptures of Java show the indelible stamp of Indian style. Broadly speaking this colonial art shows definite influences of the Gupta, Pallava and Pāla styles of art, though they were modified, to a greater or less degree, by the local genius in most cases.<sup>1a</sup>

An attempt has recently been made to distinguish the colonies in accordance with the degree of this local modification. H. G. Quartich Wales, who has gone more deeply into this branch of study than perhaps any other scholar, has startled the learned world by a number of bold hypotheses which put an altogether new complexion on the influence of Indian art in South-east Asia. He divides the

<sup>1a</sup> This point has been discussed by H. G. Wales in *The Making of Greater India*, pp. 24 ff.

colonies in this region into two broad zones, western and eastern. In his view the western zone comprising Burma, Central Siam, Malay Peninsula and Sumatra shows an extreme acculturation, *i.e.* absorption or assimilation of Indian culture, with the result that the local genius was altogether destroyed, and what we find is a mere replica of Indian art. He, therefore, regards this western zone as constituting Greater India in the narrow sense, with a purely colonial imitative culture. This was never the lot of the eastern zone, comprising mainly Java, Champā and Cambodia. Although there was very definite Indianization, it was not so extreme as to destroy local genius. The result was that with the gradual waning of Indian influence the local genius moulded the Indian pattern, and at a later stage there was a resurgence of the pre-Indian civilization. From this is drawn the inference that the great monuments of art in Kambuja and Java owe their inspiration and execution more to the local genius than to the influence of the Indian art.

The abstract principle on which this theory is based may be briefly explained. Wales starts by asking why the art of different region affected by Hindu colonization differs in essential respects from one another—why has Indo-Javanese, Cham or Khmer art its own distinctive character which it maintains throughout? He answers it by saying that each of the communities had a 'basic personality' or 'local genius',—a phrase which is intended to convey the sum of the cultural characteristics which the vast majority of the people have in common as a result of their experiences in life, *i.e.* something which approximates to what Herodotus called "national character". This pre-Indian factor in each community was differently affected by the stimulus of Indian culture. In some cases the local genius was destroyed by extreme acculturation, while it was not the case in others, and this distinguishes what he calls the western from the eastern zone.

Thus in the opinion of Wales the differentiation of arts in Hindu colonies of South-east Asia was due to the different local genius in each case, the constant features of which depended on the particular pre-Indian civilisation of each region. He then proceeds to analyse in detail the constituent elements of the primitive art of that civilization which, in his opinion, are primarily responsible for the development of those characteristic features which are not borrowed from Indian art and may be regarded as peculiar to it.

I have tried to state, as far as possible in his own words, the somewhat complex and comprehensive theory which Mr. Wales has fully developed in his latest work *The Making of Greater India*. In spite of the wealth of details and the ingenuity displayed in their elaboration, one is forced to the conclusion that not only are his laborus lost, but that they were undertaken for a hopeless task. That communities differ in their reaction upon outside stimulus needs only to be stated to be accepted as historical truths. That such a difference is partly, or even

largely, due to some inherent characteristics or particular environments, will not also be seriously disputed. But the moment we go further and try to fix upon some particular elements as the cause of this difference, we are carried beyond our depths. Mr. Wales seems to proceed upon the assumption that human society progresses in accordance with certain definite laws, and that it is possible to discover them. One may justly doubt whether there are any such laws, definitely fixed once for all. But even if there be any, it seems to be impossible to discover them, except in a very general way, and least of all with reference exclusively to any particular community. The most serious draw-back in the thesis of Mr. Wales is that he ignores the fact that the phenomena which he seeks to probe are universal in character, and cannot be solved by reference to any particular or concrete case. We should also remember that the problem with which Wales started cannot claim any striking novelty or special importance. The differentiation in the development or evolution of culture in the different Hindu colonies has an exact parallel in India itself. Specially in the domain of art, on which Wales lays so much stress, there are even more striking differences in different periods and between different regions of India, than are noticeable in the different Hindu colonies in South-east Asia. Taking a broad view of the culture as a whole, it would be difficult to maintain that its evolution in Hindu colonies of South-east Asia showed far greater changes during the first millennium than what we notice, for example, in South India. The influence of pre-Hindu element in one case and pre-Aryan element in the other is undeniable. But to regard these elements alone as essential and the Hindu or Aryan contribution as of minor importance, is equally open to objection.

In addition to this objection on general grounds, some of the fundamental assumptions of Mr. Wales rest on very weak grounds. The difference between the so-called 'eastern' and 'western' zones in their relation to Indian art seems to be highly exaggerated. The Ānanda Temple at Pagan and the Prangs at Siam, as well as many sculptures in Burma, Siam, Malay Peninsula and Sumatra, show such characteristic differences from their Indian prototypes, that it would be easy to distinguish them as of exotic growth. It is thus impossible to assert that the local genius was altogether destroyed in these regions, and there was nothing but purely imitative culture. This point will be brought home by a consideration of other relevant factors or allied features of culture. Two instances may be cited, viz. palaeography and social customs. In both these respects the local developments throughout the so-called 'western zone' of Wales are so prominent that nobody, I dare say, could regard them as merely imitative. On the other hand the palaeography of Kambuja and the Buddha images of Java, both in the 'eastern zone', exhibit less differences from their Indian prototypes than those of other regions, and the Javanese literature shows a far greater dependence upon Indian than in the case in any other colony. It is, therefore, difficult to maintain

the classification of Indian colonies into an eastern and western zone on their supposed differences in reaction to the parent culture of India.

Still more open to serious objection is the attempt of Wales to trace the differences in the art of the Indian colonies to specific elements in their pre-historic culture. Nothing but very strong and positive evidence would incline us to accept the view that a particular trait in neolithic culture remains latent during more than a thousand years of Hindu influence, and then suddenly asserts itself in such a manner as to transform the whole conception of art evolved in a steady process during many centuries. There is no doubt that there came a period in most of the colonies when Indian culture became a spent force and indigenous ideas asserted themselves more and more, bringing about fundamental changes in course of time, which some may regard as degradation and others may consider as birth of a true national culture. But these indigenous ideas are themselves the products of long contact with Indian culture, and should properly be regarded as the result of a fusion of the two. In any case the new growth is too complex in character to be easily analysed into simple constituent factors. It is difficult therefore, to agree with Mr. Wales when he says that the extreme accentuation of the angles of the upper storeys of temples may probably be ascribed to the Han element in the genius of the neolithic people of Champā or that the modification of wagon roof into a saddle roof with projecting ridge was undoubtedly determined by the Dongsonian type of roof depicted on early bronze age drums. As the latter element was fairly well-known in India, and the former is a very simple modification of Indian prototype, it is hardly necessary to ascribe their origin to the very doubtful influence of the Chinese or the prehistoric Dongsonian culture of which no clear trace is available in any sphere in South-east Asia during thousand years or more of Hindu influence. Thus the attempt of Mr. Wales to explain the evolution of Indo-Javanese, Cham, and Khmer arts on the basis of Megalithic and Dongsonian cultural elements does not carry the least conviction. But he seems to have exceeded all reasonable bounds when he observes that "the peculiar refinement and delicacy of Barabudur reliefs reflect the ability that the Javanese had acquired when their Megalithic forebears were learning to express themselves naturalistically under Han influence." Such a view can only be the result of an obsession of mind which is impervious to obvious facts and a rational interpretation of them.

I have made a long digression for considering the views of Mr. Wales as these represent the latest phase of a tendency to minimise the part played by the Hindus in the cultural evolution of South-east Asia. It has led to many theories which seek to revolutionize our whole conception of the culture and civilization of South-east Asia on extremely insufficient grounds. The common factor among them is an attempt to trace the origin of the culture of South-east Asia to all possible and impossible sources, other than Indian, and the impatient search for



the classification of Indian colonies into an eastern and western zone on their supposed differences in reaction to the parent culture of India.

Still more open to serious objection is the attempt of Wales to trace the differences in the art of the Indian colonies to specific elements in their pre-historic culture. Nothing but very strong and positive evidence would incline us to accept the view that a particular trait in neolithic culture remains latent during more than a thousand years of Hindu influence, and then suddenly asserts itself in such a manner as to transform the whole conception of art evolved in a steady process during many centuries. There is no doubt that there came a period in most of the colonies when Indian culture became a spent force and indigenous ideas asserted themselves more and more, bringing about fundamental changes in course of time, which some may regard as degradation and others may consider as birth of a true national culture. But these indigenous ideas are themselves the products of long contact with Indian culture, and should properly be regarded as the result of a fusion of the two. In any case the new growth is too complex in character to be easily analysed into simple constituent factors. It is difficult therefore, to agree with Mr. Wales when he says that the extreme accentuation of the angles of the upper storeys of temples may probably be ascribed to the Han element in the genius of the neolithic people of Champā or that the modification of wagon roof into a saddle roof with projecting ridge was undoubtedly determined by the Dongsonian type of roof depicted on early bronze age drums. As the latter element was fairly well-known in India, and the former is a very simple modification of Indian prototype, it is hardly necessary to ascribe their origin to the very doubtful influence of the Chinese or the prehistoric Dongsonian culture of which no clear trace is available in any sphere in South-east Asia during thousand years or more of Hindu influence. Thus the attempt of Mr. Wales to explain the evolution of Indo-Javanese, Cham, and Khmer arts on the basis of Megalithic and Dongsonian cultural elements does not carry the least conviction. But he seems to have exceeded all reasonable bounds when he observes that "the peculiar refinement and delicacy of Barabudur reliefs reflect the ability that the Javanese had acquired when their Megalithic forebears were learning to express themselves naturalistically under Han influence." Such a view can only be the result of an obsession of mind which is impervious to obvious facts and a rational interpretation of them.

I have made a long digression for considering the views of Mr. Wales as these represent the latest phase of a tendency to minimise the part played by the Hindus in the cultural evolution of South-east Asia. It has led to many theories which seek to revolutionize our whole conception of the culture and civilization of South-east Asia on extremely insufficient grounds. The common factor among them is an attempt to trace the origin of the culture of South-east Asia to all possible and impossible sources, other than Indian, and the impatient search for

the true home of this culture covers a wide region from China to Egypt. If an Indian opposes these views it will probably be discredited as emanating from narrow parochial views. But even at the risk of such criticism I must raise my voice of protest against this growing tendency. The prehistoric period of human culture has been sadly neglected in the past, but now the pendulum has swung to the opposite extreme, and almost everything of value is traced to prehistoric culture. We must try to recover the balance before it is too late. It is true that the theories are put forward as merely provisional and tentative, but if constantly repeated without challenge, they are likely to be gradually regarded as historical truths.

It is neither possible nor necessary to discuss at length the different features of Indian art which formed the basis of art of the Hindu colonies. As a typical example, I shall consider the evolution of the storeyed roofs of temples in the colonies from the Indian prototype. A discussion of this point is of great importance, partly because its origin has been partially traced to Han and Dongsonian elements by Mr. Wales, and partly because there is an unfounded belief, almost universal in character, about its true origin in India itself.

There is a general tendency among the writers on the subject to ascribe South India ( Pallava ) origin to temples whose roofs are composed of a number of gradually receding stories or stages. This is evidently due to the fact that, to judge from the extant examples, there is a sharp difference between the architectural style of temples in North and South India, the roof of the former being a curvilinear *śikhara* divided vertically by recesses, that of the latter consisting of a number of receding horizontal stages. This has given rise to the belief that these fundamental differences are characteristic of the architecture of Northern and Southern India. Such a belief, though very generally held, seems to be erroneous. For, though there are very few actual specimens extant today, it can be demonstrated clearly with the help of sculptural representation that roofs with gradually receding horizontal stages were very familiar in North India, at least as early as the Gupta period. As this point is of particular importance in any critical discussion of the origin of temple architecture in Greater India, I make no apology for treating this topic at some length.

The earliest representation of such temples, though in a crude form, occurs in a few sculptures such as the Kuṣāna railing pillar. J. 24 in the Mathura Museum and in the so-called Bodh-Gaya plaque at Patna<sup>1b</sup> But we have more definite specimens of this type of temples in a few sculptures from Sarnath and Bengal.

The lintel of a large doorway found among the ruins at Sarnath contains

<sup>1b</sup> Coomārswāmy—*Indian and Indonesian Art*, p. 80, figs. 69-69A, 62.

two representations of shrine and three pediments or tops of temples<sup>2</sup>. The roof of each shrine consists of three gradually receding storeys, with clear recesses between the stages, crowned by an *āmalaka* finial flanked by two leographs facing opposite directions. The three pediments, which alternate with the shrines contain each two niches, one above the other, which have the form midway between a Chaitya window of horse-type and what was known as *Kuḍu* in later days in South Indian temples of the Pallava style. The upper niches which present lion's heads or *Kīrttimukhas* are flanked by lions *sejant* in two cases, and the lower ones contain human figures.

As these sculptures must be referred to a date not later than the fifth or sixth century A.D. the representations of shrines or pediments become of special significance as we have got here the earliest specimen of that type of stepped pyramidal roof which is regarded as a peculiarity of South India and a special feature of Dravidian style. As a matter of fact the Sarnath lintel definitely proves that the so-called Dravidian style, of which the earliest specimen is found in the Pallava temples, derived its main features from temples which prevailed at an early date in North India.

Another North Indian example of the same type is illustrated by a relief sculpture on a bronze *stūpa* in Bengal of the 7th century A.D. It represents an image seated inside a temple the roof of which is "composed of two receding courses of sloping tiers with a recessed space in between and crowned by a peculiar finial."<sup>3</sup> Another image found in East Bengal (now in Dacca) shows three receding courses of tiers.<sup>4</sup> Several other examples show a large number of receding tiers, flat or sloped, sometimes as many as six in number. These are sometimes crowned by an *āmalaka* and the usual finials.<sup>5</sup> In one case we find rampant lions at the corners of the topmost storey, just beneath the *āmalaka*. In some cases we find sculptured reliefs in front of each stage. We possess also a structural example of this type in the Nandi pavilion of a temple at Ekteswar. "It is a simple square shrine with a pyramidal roof, composed of three receding tiers, resting on four square pillars."<sup>6</sup> The finial, if any, has disappeared.

Special reference should be made to one variety of this type in which the *āmalaka* is replaced by a *stūpa*, of which we find several representations in Buddhist manuscripts.<sup>7</sup> In some cases there are *stūpas* at the corner of each stage.

The wide extension of this type of temples in Northern India, and its continuity even after the evolution of the curvilinear *śikhara* are proved by the re-

2 Sahnī—*Cat. of Sarnāth Museum*, p. 233, Plates xxv-xxix.

3 *History of Bengal*, Ed. R. C. Majumdar I. 497, Plate xxviii.

4 *Cat. Dacca Museum*, Plate xlviii (b).

5 *Hist. Bengal*, Plates xxx-xxxi. Figs. 74-77.

6 *Ibid*, Plate xxxii—Fig. 80.

7 Foucher—*L'Iconographie Bouddhique de l'Inde*, Vol. I. Plate v. 1, iii. 6, vi. 3.

presentation of several temples in Bengal. One of these is the picture of a temple in Puṇḍravardhana dedicated to Trīśaraṇa Buddha Bhaṭṭāraka.<sup>8</sup> The roof of this temple consists of two sloping and two horizontal flat stages surmounted by a curvilinear *śikhara* supporting a *stūpa*. A second is represented in a sculptured slab containing an image of Arapacana-Mañjuśrī, found in Bengal, illustrated by Coomaraswamy,<sup>9</sup> who refers it to the eleventh century A.D. The roof of this temple, like the preceding one, consists of two ( or three ? ) horizontal receding stages crowned by a *stūpa* on a curvilinear *śikhara*, but there are, in addition, miniature replicas of the temple, including the *śikhara*, not only at the corners of each storey ( or of the first storey ), but also in front of the main *śikhara* at the top. A third temple of this type is represented in the background of an image of Buddha found in East Bengal and now in a private house in Dacca.<sup>10</sup> Here the roof consists of three receding stages crowned by a curvilinear *śikhara*. In the last two cases there is a recess between the stages so that each stage has a sufficiently wide margin to serve as circumambulatory passage round the next one. Another image in Bengal shows a *śikhara* surmounted by *stūpa*.<sup>11</sup> These types of temples must have also prevailed in Bihar and Orissa, as similar shrines in Oḍra and Tirabhukti are outlined in miniature paintings in Buddhist manuscripts, noticed by Foucher.<sup>12</sup>

Now, the miniature representation of temples of this type occurs also in a number of terracotta votive tablets from Pagan, and a stone sculpture in Prome both representing ancient capitals of Hindu colonial kingdoms in Burma. These tablets in Burma may be said to be almost replicas of the pictures of temples in Eastern India. One of the votive tablets in Pagan is inscribed with the Buddhist formula ' *ye dharmā* ' etc. in Nāgarī character.

A still further development of this style is depicted in the stone sculptures from Ānanda Temple in Pagan showing roofs composed of receding stages, five seven, and nine in number. There is no doubt that this type is represented in the structural examples known as Pyatthat, which continued to be built up to the 19th century by Burmese Kings.<sup>13</sup> The description of Lohapāsāda in *Mahāvārha* shows that similar structures with nine storeys were built in Ceylon also.

The reason why this style was popular in these Buddhist countries is perhaps furnished by the statement in the Nidāna-kathā, the preface to the Jātaka, that three palaces were built for young prince Siddhārtha; one had nine storeys, another seven, and the third, five. The passage in Jātaka thus also furnishes

8 *Ibid*, Plate iii. 4. Also cf. Plate v. 3.

9 *Op. cit.*, fig. 229.

10 *Cat. Dacca Museum*, p. 31. Plate ix. B.

11 *ASI*, 1921-2, Plate xxix.

12 *Op. cit.* Plates iii. 4; v. 13: vi, 5; vii. 1.

13 *ASI*, 1912-3, p. 140.

literary evidence for the existence, at an early date, of the temples which we find represented in paintings and sculptures of a later date.

Bearing the above facts in mind we may now trace the influence of this type of temples in South-east Asia. Beginning with Burma, we can clearly trace it in some of the famous shrines at Pagan. These are square temples with a roof consisting of several receding stages crowned by either a *stūpa* or a curvilinear *śikhara*. As we have seen above, the miniature representations of East Indian temples, particularly those in Bengal, show exactly the same features; viz. a tiered roof surmounted by a crowning superstructure which is either a *stūpa* or a *śikhara*. The Abeyandana and the Patothamya temples at Pagan represent the former, while the Ānanda, the Thatbyinnyu, the Thitswada, the Tilominlo and others represent the latter type. There can be, therefore, hardly any doubt that the style of these temples might have been possibly derived from that of Northern, more particularly, Eastern India.

Yet the origin of the temples at Pagan has long been a subject of keen controversy. As these temples did not resemble any particular class of temples, actually existing in India, there has been much speculation on the subject. Although much of it is not worth serious consideration, and is today of mere academic interest, I shall make a brief reference to the different views as they throw into relief the general mentality of scholars, who have dealt with the origin of art, in South-east Asia, and the danger of forming definite conclusion on a superficial knowledge of the subject.

Duroiselle, writing in 1913-14, held "that the ante-type of the Ānanda temple should be looked for in the Ananta cave of the Udayagiri Hills" in Orissa and further observed that "there can be little doubt that the Ānanda and the other temples at Pagan in the same style are imitations of the cave-temples of India." He traced the influence of Nepal, Tibet, North India, Cambodia and China in the temples at Pagan, and remarked as follows: "Although the style of the Pagan temples and pagodas in its large and principal lines, can ultimately be traced to North-east India, it has characteristics all its own which entitle it to rank as a style apart."<sup>14</sup> In the Annual Report of 1916-7 (p. 29) for the Burma Circle, the Superintendent, probably Duroiselle himself, refers to the Manuha temple, crowned by a small *stūpa* resting on seven receding terraces, and observes that "the archetype of this class of monuments is probably Bhīma's ratha of Mahābalipuram" in South India. In the next year's report (p. 20) it is definitely stated about the Ānanda, Sulamani, Thatbyinnyu and other temples of this class, that "these are structures based on South Indian models."

Ten years later a Bengali scholar drew the attention of the scholars to the miniature representation of temples in Bengal noted above, and pointed out their bearing on the origin of Ānanda and other temples in Pagan. But evidently

<sup>14</sup> Arch. Report, Burma Circle, 1913-4, p. 16.

no notice was taken of it. It was not till another period of ten years passed by, that Duroiselle seems to have been struck for the first time by the close resemblance between Ānanda and the miniature temples represented on a stone sculpture and a terracotta votive tablet, "both of which may be assigned, on stylistic grounds, to a date at least about a century or so earlier than the Ānanda."<sup>15</sup> He also refers to terracotta votive tablets of the time of Aniruddha found in Pagan itself with representation of similar temples. He further refers to similar temple-type on two image-sculptures found in Bengal, though he makes no mention of either the miniature paintings published by Foucher or numerous other representations of similar temples on image-sculptures to which reference has been made above. But even from the few specimens, known to him, he concluded "that there were at Pagan, Prome, and may be also at Thaton in Burma, and Bengal, temples or models of temples from which the Ānanda might be easily evolved."<sup>16</sup>

It is unfortunate that Duroiselle did not notice the miniature paintings, for then he could have seen that the crowning *śikhara* in the stone sculpture from Prome<sup>17</sup> is almost an exact replica of what is found in the representation of a temple at Puṇḍravardhana.<sup>18</sup>

There are several facts which should be borne in mind in tracing the origin of the Ānanda temple. In the first place the temples in Bengal, of which we find miniature representations in Buddhist manuscripts and sculptures, were much earlier than the Ānanda temple built about A.D. 1090. The roof of one of these has actually receding courses of *sloping* tiers exactly as we find in the Ānanda Temple at Pagan. The votive tablets at Pagan, which are earlier in date, are inscribed in East Indian characters of the Pala period. This proves a close intercourse between East India and Burma which we also learn from Burmese traditions. Excavations at Paharpur in North Bengal in 1925 have exposed the remains of a massive temple of unique type and it is now generally admitted that this "could in all probability serve as an ultimate prototype of the temples in Burma, including the Ānanda at Pagan."<sup>19</sup>

All these facts point to East Indian temples as serving the models of the temples in Burma, and fully entitle us to be more emphatic in this regard than is implied in Duroiselle's somewhat vague statement quoted above. Nevertheless there is little doubt that Duroiselle's views underwent a great change since 1913-14 as will be evident from the following passage in his *Memoir on the Ananda Temple*, published in 1937.

15 *Memoir of Arch. Survey*, No. 56. Pagan Temple, p. 5.

16 *Ibid.*

17 *Ibid*, Plate ii. 2.

18 Foucher—*Icon. Boud.* I, Plate iii. 4.

19 *Memoir of Arch. Survey*, No. 55—Paharpur, p. 6.

"There can be no doubt that the architects who planned and built the Ānanda were Indians. Everything in this temple from *śikhara* to basement, as well as the numerous stone sculptures found in its corridors and the terracotta plaques adorning its basement and terraces, bear the indubitable stamp of Indian genius and craftsmanship, except in one particular (namely the Mon legends). It may be here remarked *en passant*, that from 1056-57 when, after the conquest of Thaton, the extraordinary architectural, sculptural and painting activity began in Pagan, to about the beginning of the XIIIth century, practically nothing is to be found that does not bear the stamp of Indian workmanship; this may be affirmed even of such early votive tablets which bear the inscriptions in old Burmese characters and the language of which is either Pali or Burmese (these latter rather rare); everything on them...but the inscription, is Indian. In this sense, we may take it therefore, that the Ānanda, though built in the Burmese capital, is an Indian temple."<sup>20</sup>

It is interesting to compare this with the view expressed in 1925 by the eminent French archaeologist Parmentier that the relation or filiation of Pagan with the art of India is not evident, and but for the presence of the *śikhara* it could not at all be predicated.<sup>21</sup>

The progress of this type of temples with tiered roofs in receding stages can be traced all over Indo-China. The temples at Bayang (7th century A.D.) and Prast Prah Srei (7th century A.D.) in Kambuja with three receding stages furnish early examples. Two centuries later, we have the temple of Bakong (9th century A.D.) in the Angkor region with four or five receding stages.

The same type dominates the temples of Champā almost from beginning to end. The famous temples at Myson, Dong Duong, Po Nagar, Pho Hai and Po Klong Gorai show developed specimens of this type, while comparatively only a few temples have a different kind of roof.

In Java also we meet with the same type at Dieng, Kalasan, Mendut and Pavon and it has been preserved down to our own times in the island of Bali.

It will thus be seen that the type of temples with roof composed of receding stages is a characteristic feature in all the Hindu colonies in South-east Asia. As this type was formerly known to exist only in South India, though in a modified form, it was naturally that the architectural type was carried to South-east Asia by immigrants from South India, and generally Pallava origin was ascribed to them. But in view of what has been said above, it is now necessary to reconsider the whole question. We have treated the case in Burma at some length in order to demonstrate beyond any doubt the possibility that this type was borrowed from Eastern India. There is no more valid reason to treat the all other

20 *Ibid*, No. 56—Ānanda Temple, p. 9.

21 *Et. As.* II, 226.

temples in South-east Asia as derived from South Indian prototype than there was originally in the case of Burma.

A few striking points of similarity may be noted in this connection. In the temple of Pavon in Java we find a *stūpa* as the crowning member of the roof in receding stages, exactly as we find in Burma and some miniature representations of temples in Bengal. The Chandi Bima in Dieng Plateau in Java, which forms a class by itself in this type, possesses a striking resemblance with the temple at Bhitargaon near Kanpur and the Lakṣmaṇa temple at Sirpur.<sup>22</sup> The close resemblance of this type with the temple of Lopburi in Siam ( 11th century ) is also obvious.

It may be further pointed out that while in the Dravidian Pallava style the super-imposed stages present a pyramidal shape with sharp angular outline, quite a large number of temple roofs in South-east Asia present an altogether different appearance which is more akin to the characteristic flat stages of Northern India of the Gupta period.

I would like to conclude this discourse by referring to an important fact which is always ignored by the class of writers who want to minimise the influence of India upon the development of art in South-east Asia. It is a well-known fact that there was a complete collapse of artistic ideas in this region as soon as the Hindu culture was submerged by the onslaught of Islam. I may quote in this connection the following passage of Fergusson. Referring to the overthrow of the Hindu dynasty in Java, he remarks:

“ Then occurred what was, perhaps, the least-expected event in all “ this strange eventful history. ” It is as if the masons had thrown away their tools and the chisels had dropped from the hands of the carvers. From that time forward no building was erected in Java, and no image carved, that is worth even a passing notice. At a time when the Muhammadans were adorning India with monuments of surpassing magnificence, no one in Java thought of building either a mosque, or a tomb, or a palace that would be deemed respectable in any second class state in any part of the world. ”<sup>23</sup>

Is it conceivable that such a state of things would have followed if the great art of Java was due in any special measure to the local genius of the people? For the local people continued, as before, under the Muslim regime. The only factor that was wanting is the perennial source of supply from India which had dried up, and the absence of that Hindu culture which inspired the developments in art and other aspects of civilization. This one fact alone is sufficient to indicate the vitally important part played by the Hindus in the development of culture and civilization in South-east Asia.

22 *Indian and Indonesian Art*, p. 94, Brown—*Architecture*, p. 233.

23 Fergusson—*Hist. of Ind. Architecture*, II, 421.



## INDEX

### A

- Abeyandana, 89.  
 Abhimānottuṅga, 48.  
 Abhirāja, 9, 31.  
 Abu Zayd Ḥasan, 43.  
 Āditya, 29.  
 Afghanistan, 4.  
 Agastya, 76.  
 Airlaṅga, 50, 51.  
 Ālavi-rāṣṭra, 54.  
 Alberuni, 40, 41.  
*Amara-kośa*, 65.  
*Amaramālā*, 65.  
 Amarāvati ( province ), 57.  
 Amarāvati ( style ), 32.  
 Ānanda Temple, 80-91.  
 Ananta Cave, 89.  
 Andaman, 5.  
 Angkor, 3, 20, 53, 56, 81.  
 Aniruddha, 58, 59.  
 Annam, 3, 4, 11, 12, 13, 24, 26, 35, 52,  
 54, 67, 80.  
 Arakan, 31.  
 Arimardanapura, 58.  
*Arjuna-vivāha*, 65.  
*Artha-śāstra*, 5.  
 Aśoka, 9, 71.  
 Aśva-varman, 33.  
 Aurelius, Marcus, 12.

### B

- Bactria, 4.  
 Bālaputra, Śrī, 39.  
 Bal Chanar, 57.  
 Bali, 3, 33, 35, 51, 52, 66, 73, 75, 78.  
 Bali, *devadāsīs* in, 79.

- Bali, Musicians in, 79.  
 Bali, *satīs* in, 79.  
 Bali, slaves in, 79.  
 Banka, 36, 37.  
 Barabudūr, 39, 42, 50, 81.  
 Barhiṇadvīpa, 33.  
 Bassac, 24.  
 Batavia, 32.  
*Baudhāyana Dharma-Sūtra*, 19.  
 Bayang, 91.  
 Bay of Bandon, 5, 37.  
 Bayon, temple of, 56.  
 Belahan, 51.  
 Bhadra-varman, 27, 64, 70.  
*Bhārata-yuddha*, 65.  
 Bhagadatta, 29.  
 Bharadvāja, 19.  
 Bhāravi, 63.  
 Bhaṭṭa, Divākara, 76  
 Bhavapura, 9.  
 Bhava-varman, 24, 52.  
 Bhīmaka, 63.  
*Bhoma-kāvya*, 65.  
 Bodh-Gayā, 59.  
 Bogo, 31.  
 Borneo, 3, 33, 35, 51, 61, 72.  
*Brahmaṇḍa Purāṇa*, 65.  
*Brhat-kathā*, 7.  
 Broach, 4.  
 Buddhaghoṣa, 71.  
 Burma, 2, 3, 11, 31, 32, 35, 54, 55, 58,  
 59, 60, 66, 71, 72, 73, 80.  
 Burmese Kings, 88.

### C

- Caiya, 5.  
 Cakratīrtha-svāmin, 69.

- Cambodia, 3, 21, 24, 31, 35, 36, 44, 53, 73, 80.  
*Cāṇakya-śataka*, 65.  
 Canton, 45, 67.  
 Célebes, 3, 11, 35, 67.  
 Ceylon, 49, 59, 88.  
 Chaiya, 30, 49.  
 Chammadevi, 30.  
 Champā, 3, 23, 25, 28, 29, 36, 44, 45, 50-58, 62, 65, 66, 67, 69, 70, 73, 75, 77, 78, 83.  
 Champā, Han element in, 86.  
 Champā, Temples in, 80.  
 Chandana, 22, 23.  
 Chaṇḍi Bima, 92.  
 Chaṇḍi Kalasan, 50.  
 Chaṇḍi Mendut, 39, 42, 50.  
 Chandrabhānu, 49.  
 Chatterji, B. R., 19.  
 Chen-song, 22.  
 China, 2-4, 16, 23, 25, 43, 45, 46, 48, 52, 53, 54.  
 Chindwin, 2.  
 Cholas, 6, 43, 47, 48, 59.  
 Cho-po, 44.  
 Chu-Ying, 22.  
 Cochín-China, 3, 9, 21, 53.  
 Coedès, 19, 25, 26, 30, 40, 41, 64.  
 Cornelian Seal, 30.  
 Crawford, 73.
- D
- Daba, 44.  
 Dangrek, 3.  
 Dantapura, 9.  
 Devapāla, 39.  
 Deva-varman, 11.  
 Dharaṇīndra, 39, 41, 42.  
 Dharmanagarī, 52.  
 Dharmapāla, 42.  
 Dharma-setu, 42.
- Divākara Bhaṭṭa, 76.  
 Divākara Paṇḍita, 55.  
 Dongsonian, 85.  
 Dravidians, 13.  
 Duroiselle, 89-91.  
 Dvāravatī, 30, 58.
- E
- East Indies, 2, 4.  
 Egypt, 3.  
 Ekteshwar, 87.
- F
- Fa-hein, 32, 73.  
 Fan Chan, 18, 22.  
 Fan chang, 22.  
 Fan-che-man, 21-23, 26.  
 Fan-hu-ta, 27.  
 Fan-Siun, 22, 23.  
 Ferrand, 11.  
 Finot, 25, 26.  
 Foucher, 88, 90.  
 Fu-nan, 9-10, 14, 18, 20-26, 28, 29, 35, 36, 52, 61, 67, 68, 75, 77.
- G
- Galathee, S. S., 57.  
 Gamelan, 13.  
 Gaṅgā, 3, 17, 18, 73.  
 Gaṅgārāja, 27.  
 Gauḍa, 52.  
 Gautama, 64.  
 Godāvarī, 31.  
 Gomatī, 32.  
 Greater India, 2.  
 Greeks, 14.  
 Guṇavarman, 68, 72.
- H
- Haṁsāvatī, 31, 58.  
 Hari-bhuñjaya, 54.

*Harivamśa*, 65.  
 Hasan, Abu Zayd, 43.  
 Herodotus, 83.  
 Hindu Colonization, 1, 8, 11, 14-17, 20,  
     21, 35, 83.  
 Hindu Culture, 8, 14, 53, 61, 92.  
 Hippalus, 16, 17.  
 Hiranyadāma, 53, 76.  
 Hiuen Tsang, 30, 32.  
 Hoan Sonh, 27.  
 Ho-ling, 32.  
 Huen P'an huang, 21.  
 Huen-tien, 9.

## I

Ibn Khordadbeh, 42.  
 Ibn Rosteh, 42, 45.  
 Indo-China, 1-3, 7, 11-14, 35, 53, 54.  
 Indonesia, 1, 3, 7, 13, 35.  
 Indra-varman, 53, 54.  
 Indra-varman, III, 65.  
*Indravijaya*, 65.  
 Insulinde, 3.  
 Isāna-varman, 28, 53.  
 I-tsing, 4, 36 37, 72.

## J

Jambi, 36, 37.  
 Jambudvīpa, 52.  
 Janapada, 76.  
 Jātakas, 7, 8, 88.  
 Jātāvarman Vīra Pāṇḍya, 49.  
 Java, 3, 9-13, 32, 33, 35, 37, 45, 46, 48-54,  
     61, 66, 67, 72, 76, 80, 82.  
 Java, architecture in, 82.  
 Java, Islam in, 93.  
 Java, Megalithic element in, 86.  
 Java, sculptures of, 82.  
 Jaya Indravarmadeva VII, 64.  
 Jayanāśa, 37.  
 Jaya-Siṃhavarman, 57,

Jayavardhana, 51.  
 Jaya-varman, 23, 44, 53, 67, 68.  
 Jaya-varman, II, 53, 63, 64, 76.  
 Jaya-varman, V, 54.  
 Jaya-varman, VII, 55, 56, 78.  
 Jaya-varman VIII, 56.  
 Jember, 33.

## K

Kaḍiri, 51.  
 Kalah-bar, 42, 43.  
 Kalasan, 39, 42.  
*Kālayavanāntaka*, 65.  
 Kālidāsa, 63.  
 Kālīṅga, 32, 50.  
*Kāmasūtra*, 63.  
 Kambu, 24.  
 Kambuja, 3, 9, 24, 28, 29, 44, 45, 50-57,  
     62, 64, 66, 68, 69, 73-78.  
 Kambuja, architecture in, 82, 91.  
 Kambuja, palaeography of, 84.  
 Kandarpa-dharma, 27.  
 K'ang T'ai, 10, 21-23.  
 Kanran, 31.  
 Kan-to-li, 29.  
 Kapilavastu, 31.  
 Kapuas, 33.  
 Karens, 31.  
 Karṇāṭaka, 50, 52.  
 Karpūra-dvīpa, 34.  
*Kathā-kośa*, 7.  
*Kathāsarit-sāgara*, 63.  
 Kattigara, 21.  
 Kaunḍinya, 9, 10, 19, 21, 22-24, 29, 33,  
     77.  
 Kauśāmbī, 58.  
 Kauṭilya, 5.  
 Keddah ( Kedah ), 5, 29, 30, 47, 70.  
 Kedu, 42.  
 Kelurak, 39, 41.  
 Khanh-Hoa, 10, 25,  
 Khasis, 13.

Khmer, 20, 44, 50, 53.  
 Khong, 3.  
 Kia Tan, 4.  
 Kin-to-li, 29.  
 Kiu-lien, 24, 25.  
 K'iu tu, 21.  
 Kombeng, 33, 73.  
 Kota-Kapur, 36.  
 Kra, Isthmus of, 2, 5, 28, 37, 42, 43.  
 Krishna, 31.  
*Kṛṣṇāyana*, 65.  
 Kṛtanagara, 51.  
 Kshmera-rāṣṭra, 54.  
 Kuala Selinsing, 13.  
 Kublai Khan, 51, 57, 59, 60.  
 Kulaprabhāvatī, 68.  
 Kulottuṅga, 48.  
 Kumāraghoṣa, 39.  
 Kuṇḍuṅga, 33.  
 Kurumbanagara, 68.  
 Kuṣāṇas, 14, 22.  
 Kuṭci, 33.  
 Kuṭhāra, 26.  
 Kyanzittha, 59.

## L

Lang-ya-Su, 11, 28, 29.  
 Lankasuka, 28.  
 Laos, 3, 21, 24.  
 Lavapurī, 54.  
 Levi, S., 20, 22.  
*Liang Dynasty, History of*, 20, 21, 28,  
 29, 33, 77.  
 Ligor, 9, 28, 30, 37, 38, 39, 41, 43.  
 Lin-yang, 11.  
 Lin-yi, 24, 25.  
 Lohapāsāda, 88.  
 Lopburi, 30, 92.

## M

Madura, 51.  
 Magelang, 32.

Mahābalipuram, 89.  
*Mahābhārata*, 63, 65, 75.  
*Mahābhāṣya*, 63.  
*Mahāvamśa*, 88.  
 Mahendrapāla, 65.  
 Mahendravarman, 52.  
 Majapahit, 39, 51, 52, 65.  
 Malabar, 17.  
 Malacca, 3, 48, 52.  
 Malaya Peninsula, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 11,  
 13, 17, 21, 22, 28-30, 35, 39, 41-44,  
 51, 55, 71.  
 Mañjuśrī, 39.  
*Manohara*, 63.  
 Manoratha-varman, 27.  
 Manu, 63.  
 Manuha, 89.  
*Manu-Saṁhitā*, 63.  
 Māra, Śrī, 10, 25-27.  
 Marseilles, 1.  
 Martaban, 52.  
 Maśūdī, 43-45.  
 Matarām, 50.  
 Ma Twan-lin, 29.  
 Maungun, 71.  
 Mauryas, 47.  
 Mayūra, 63.  
 Megasthenes, 6.  
 Mekong, 2, 3, 5, 20.  
 Menam, 2, 5, 54.  
*Milindapanha*, 7, 28.  
 Molucca, 3.  
 Mon, 30, 31, 58, 59.  
 Moza, 71.  
 Mramma, 31.  
 Mūlavarman, 33, 73.  
 Myson, 27.

## N

Nāgadatta, 7.  
 Nāgapattana, 46.

*Nāgara Kṛtāgama*, 51, 52.  
 Nāgasena, 67.  
 Nakhon Sṛi Dhammarat, 30.  
 Nālandā, 39-42, 46,  
 Nan-chao ( Mithilā-rāṣṭra ), 54.  
 Nārikela-dvīpa, 34.  
 Nepal, 89.  
 New Guinea, 3.  
*New History of T'ang Dynsaty*, 45.  
 Nha-trang, 25.  
 Nicobar, 5, 47.  
 Nidāna-Kathā, 88.  
*Niddesa*, 7, 11, 28.  
 Nile, The, 3.  
*Nīti-sāra*, 65.  
*Nīti-Śāstra*, 63.  
*Nyāya-sūtra*, 63.

## O

Oc-Eo, 11, 12, 21.  
 Oman, 43.  
 Orissa, 17, 88, 89.

## P

Pagan, 31, 56, 58, 59, 88-91.  
 Pahang, 29.  
 Pālas, 15.  
 Palembang, 36, 37.  
 Pāli, 28, 32.  
 Pallavas, 15, 18, 19, 86, 87, 91-92.  
 Paloura, 4, 17.  
 Paṇaṁkarna, Mahārāja, 39, 41, 42.  
*Pañcatantra*, 65, 66.  
 Pāṇini, 62-64.  
 P'an-p'an, 22, 29.  
 Parmentier, 80, 81.  
*Pārthayajña*, 65.  
 Pāśupatas, 68.  
 Patothamya, 89.  
 Paṭṭikera, 58, 59.  
 Pegu, 9, 31,

Pelliot, 11, 16, 20.  
 Perak, 28, 30.  
*Periplus of The Erythrean Sea*, 4, 17.  
 Phanrang, 57.  
 Phillippine, 3.  
 P'iao, 32.  
 Pnom Penh, 3.  
 Po-Bia, 57.  
 Po-li, 77.  
 Pong Tuk, 12, 30, 71.  
 Prabhāsa-dharma, 27.  
 Prajñā-Pāramitā, 70.  
 Prakāśa-dharma-Vikrānta-varman, 28,  
 70.  
 Pra Pathom, 30.  
 Pravarasena, 63.  
 Prome, 31, 32, 71, 88.  
 Ptolemy, 5, 11, 17, 21, 28, 31, 32.  
 Pūrṇa-varman, 33, 50, 73.  
 Pyatthar, 88.  
 Pyu, 31, 32.

## Q

Quang Nam, 24.

## R

*Raghuvamśa*, 63.  
 Rājalakṣmī, 76.  
 Rājārāja ( Chola king ), 46, 47.  
 Rājasa, 51.  
 Rājasanagara, 51, 52.  
 Rājaśekhara, 64, 65.  
 Rājavidyādhara, 48.  
 Rājendra ( Chola King ), 46-49.  
 Rājendra-varman, 54, 62, 76.  
 Rāmaññadeśa, 30, 58.  
 Rāmāvatī, 58.  
*Rāmāyaṇa*, 11, 32, 63, 65, 75.  
 Ratburi, 30.  
 Rome, 12, 56.  
 Rudravarman, 27, 68, 75.

## S

- Sa-huynh, 13.  
 Śailendras, 38-54, 56.  
 Śaivism, 67-79, 72.  
 Śakas, 14.  
 Salween, 2.  
 Samarāgravīra, 39, 42.  
*Samarāichcha-kahā*, 7.  
 Samaroṭtuṅga, 42.  
*Sāmaveda*, 75.  
 Sambas, 33.  
 Samrong Seu, 13.  
 Samudra-gupta, 6, 15, 22.  
 San-fo-tsi, 45, 46, 47-52.  
 Saṅgrāma-Vijayottuṅga-Varman, 48, 49.  
 Saṅjaya, 42, 44, 50.  
 Śaṅkarācārya, 76.  
 Sankissa, 9.  
 Sankissa, ( Tagaung ), 31.  
 Sannāha, 50.  
 Sari-Pāla-varma, 29.  
 Sarvajñamuni, 76.  
 Śarvāṇī, 28.  
 Sastri, K.A.N., 40, 41, 47.  
 Sātavāhana, 6.  
 Śāvaka, 49.  
 Sdok Kak Thom ( Insc. ), 76.  
 Seguntang, 33.  
 Sempaga, 13, 34.  
*Setubandha*, 63.  
 Siam, 2, 3, 11, 21, 24, 35, 50, 52, 54, 55,  
 58, 60, 61, 67, 71, 73, 80, 83.  
 Siang-lin, 25.  
 Siddhārtha, 88.  
 Si-li-tieh-hwa ( Śrīdeva ), 48.  
 Siṃhala, 50.  
 Siṃhāvalokitanyāya, 63.  
 Sindhu, 3, 4.  
 Siṇḍok, 50.  
 Singapore, 2.  
 Singhasāri, 51.  
 Siraf, 43.  
 Si Tep, 5, 30, 71.  
 Sittang, 2.  
 Śivakaivalya, 76.  
 Śivasoma, 76.  
*Smaradahana*, 65.  
 Somā, ( Nāga Princess ), 9, 21, 23.  
 Soṇa, 72.  
 South-East Asia, 1, 2, 4-7, 12-23, 34  
 53, 54, 81-86, 89, 91, 92.  
 South India, 17, 18, 19.  
 Śreṣṭha-varman, 23, 24.  
 Sribuza ( Śrī-Vijaya ), 40, 42, 43.  
 Śrī Deva, 30, 48.  
 Śrīkṣetra, 31, 32, 58.  
 Śrī Vijaya, 33, 37, 38, 40-43, 46, 47, 48.  
 Śrutavarman, 24.  
 Śuddhodana, 33.  
 Sudhammavati, 31.  
*Sut-Dynasty, History of*, 33.  
 Sukhodaya, 54.  
 Sulamani, 89.  
 Sulaymān, 42.  
*Sumanasāntaka*, 65.  
 Sumatra, 3, 6, 11, 33, 35, 38-41, 43,  
 51, 61, 68, 83.  
 Sunda, 3, 52.  
 Śūra, 63.  
*Sūryasataka*, 63.  
 Sūrya-varman, 54, 55.  
 Sūrya-varman II, 55.  
 Suśruta, 63.  
 Suvarṇa-bhūmi, 7, 34, 71.  
 Suvarṇa-dvīpa, 7, 34, 39-42.  
 Suvarṇa-grāma, 54.  
 ( Śyāmala ), 31.

## T

- Tagaung, 31.  
 Takkola, 18, 28.  
 Taḡua Pa, 5, 28, 30.

## INDEX

n

Talaings, 30, 31.  
 Tāmbraliṅgam, 28, 49.  
 Tamil, 46.  
 Tāmralipti, 4, 17, 18.  
 T'ang dynasty, 20.  
 T'ang dynasty, New History of, 4  
 T'ang Period, 32.  
 Ta-Prohm, 69.  
 Tārā, 39, 42.  
 Tārumā, 32.  
 Tavoy, 5, 58.  
 Telingana, 30.  
 Tenasserim, 58.  
 T'eu-Kiu-li, 28.  
 Thailand, 2, 57.  
 Thamala, 31.  
 Thatbyinnyu, 89.  
 Thaton, 9, 31, 58, 90.  
 Thitswada, 89.  
 Three Pagodas, Pass of, 5.  
 Thua Thien, 26.  
 Tiao-pien, 11.  
 Tibet, 89.  
 Ti-chen, 27.  
 Tien-chu, 22.  
 Tien-Suen, 21.  
 Tilominlo, 89.  
 Tissa, 31.  
 T'o Mu, 20.  
 Tonkin, 2, 23, 24, 26, 54.  
 Tonle Sap, 3.  
 Trang, 28.  
 Tuen-Siun, 10.  
 Tuk Mas, 32.  
 Tuṅḡṣa, 68.

## U

Udayagiri, 89.  
 Uttara, 71.

Vaiśālī, 59.  
 Vaiṣṇavism, 67, 72.  
 Vanagiri, 50.  
 Varmasetu, 39, 42.  
 Vat Phu, 24.  
 Vātsyāyana, 63.  
*Vāyu Purāṇa*, 33.  
 Vidyāpuṣpa, 68.  
 Viet Nam, 2.  
 Vijaya, 51.  
 Vimala, 31.  
 Virarājendra, 48  
 Viśālākṣa, 63.  
 Viṣṇu, 38, 68, 70.  
 Viṣṇu-varman, 30.  
 Vo Chanh, 10, 25, 26, 61, 69.  
 Vrah Guhya, 55.  
 Vyādhapura, 20.

## W

Wajang, 13.  
 Wales, H. G. Quaritch, 14, 82-86.  
 Wellesley, 30.

Yaśodharapura, 53.  
 Yaśo-varman, 53, 54, 57, 62-64, 74.  
 Yava-bhūmi, 39, 40.  
 Yava-dvīpa, 11, 34, 53.  
 Ye-tiao, 11.  
 Yoga, 64.  
 Yomas, 2.  
 Yonaka-rāṣṭra, 54.  
 Yunnan, 4, 53, 54.

Zābag, 40, 45, 46, 48, 49, 50.

लाल बहादुर शास्त्री राष्ट्रीय प्रशासन अकादमी, पुस्तकालय  
L.B.S. National Academy of Administration, Library

## MUSSOORIE

115550

यह पुस्तक निम्नांकित तारीख तक वापिस करनी है।

This book is to be returned on the date last stamped

[illegible]



940.01

Maj

**LIBRARY**

LAL BAHADUR SHASTRI

**National Academy of Administration  
MUSSOORIE**

43449

Accession No.

115556

1. Books are issued for 15 days only but may have to be recalled earlier if urgently required.
2. An over-due charge of 25 Paise per day per volume will be charged.
3. Books may be renewed on request, at the discretion of the Librarian.
4. Periodicals, Rare and Reference books may not be issued and may be consulted only in the Library.
5. Books lost, defaced or injured in any way shall have to be replaced or its double price shall be paid by the borrower.